

A COMMENTARY ON JEROME'S *CONTRA VIGILANTIUM*

BY

AMY HYE OH

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Philology
with a concentration in Medieval Studies
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Danuta Shanzer
Professor Ralph Mathisen
Professor Jon Solomon
Professor Stephan Heilan, University of Osnabrück

ABSTRACT

Innkeepers inspired this dissertation. After working on ‘innkeepers’ as a topic for a research seminar paper, I soon discovered that the term *caupo* counted as an insult according to several church fathers, including Jerome. In the *Contra Vigilantium*, Jerome mocked his enemy, Vigilantius, by calling him a *caupo* who mixed water with wine; I wondered whether the title was true and the insult was deserved. What remained was to figure out who this man was and why he mattered.

The dissertation is comprised of four parts: introductory chapters, a text with an *en face* translation, a philological/historical commentary, and appendices. The first chapter introduces Vigilantius, discusses why a commentary of the *Contra Vigilantium* is needed, and provides a biography, supported by literary and historical evidence in response to the bolder and more fanciful account of W.S. Gilly.¹ The second chapter treats Vigilantius as an exegete. From a sample of his exegesis preserved in Jerome’s *Ep.* 61, I determine that Jerome dismissed Vigilantius’ exegesis because he wanted to protect his own orthodoxy. The third chapter situates Vigilantius in the debate on relic worship. His position is valuable because he opposed most of his contemporaries, decrying relics instead of supporting their translation and veneration.

The Latin text and format are taken from Jean-Louis Feiertag’s *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* volume published in 2005.² Verbatim citations of Vigilantius are fully capitalized and biblical citations are italicized. The present text is not a new critical edition, but aims to improve some of Feiertag’s editorial choices, which, although representative of the manuscript

¹ Gilly, W. 1844. *Vigilantius and his times*. London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley.

² Feiertag, J.-L. 2005a. Hieronymus: *Adversus Vigilantium*. *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 79C. Turnhout: Brepols.

tradition, render the text more difficult to read. Each sentence of the Latin text is numbered and directs the reader to the corresponding sentence in the commentary.

The commentary follows the model of the Gröningen commentaries on Apuleius.³ The text and translation are provided in smaller units and immediately precede the commentary for ease of reference. I also provide in the appendix a translation of *Epp.* 61 and 109, the text taken from Hilberg's *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* edition, as it is referenced and commented upon at various points throughout the dissertation. Following the letters is a short discussion on the genre of the *Contra Vigilantium*. All translations, unless otherwise stated, are my own.

³ Hijmans, B.L. et al., eds. 1995. *Gröningen Commentaries on Apuleius*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

To Daniel, as promised: sine quo non.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In writing this dissertation, I have accumulated a great deal of debt. The first debt of gratitude is owed to my adviser, Danuta Shanzer. Her expertise and generosity exemplify the kind of scholar and mentor I hope to be. I would also like to thank Ralph Mathisen, who guided me through late antique history and suggested new approaches, and my committee members, Stephan Heilen and Jon Solomon, for providing insightful comments and criticism. I am very grateful to the faculty of the Department of the Classics. Their support and encouragement were instrumental in keeping me motivated throughout my graduate career. To the wonderful group of graduate students, I would like to give special thanks for teaching me so much with their friendship and scholarship. I am indebted to the Graduate Women's Group: this outcome would have looked completely different without the amazing women who helped me in the process. For his critical eye and for sharing a special relationship with Jerome, I would like to thank Philip Polcar. I would also like to thank Isabella Kim on the other side of the country and Angela Kinney on the other side of the world for traveling this journey with me as friends, advisers, and women whom I greatly admire. Lastly, I would like to thank Daniel Abosso for being my family for the past ten years. His patience, good humor, resourcefulness, and unceasing support have been invaluable and I remain happily in his debt.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AB</i>	<i>Anchor Bible</i>
<i>AJ</i>	<i>Adversus Jovinianum</i>
<i>BLE</i>	<i>Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique</i>
<i>CCSL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum Series Latina</i>
<i>CH</i>	<i>Church History</i>
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Contra Iohannem</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CP</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CPG</i>	<i>Corpus Patrologia Graeca</i>
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
<i>CSHB</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae</i>
<i>CTh</i>	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i>
<i>CV</i>	<i>Contra Vigilantium</i>
<i>CW</i>	<i>Classical World</i>
<i>DACL</i>	<i>Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie</i>
<i>EME</i>	<i>Early Medieval Europe</i>
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die griechische christlichen Schriftsteller</i>
<i>HThR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JLA</i>	<i>Journal of Late Antiquity</i>
<i>JML</i>	<i>Journal of Medieval Latin</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JThS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LHS</i>	<i>Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr</i>
<i>LIMC</i>	<i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i>
<i>PCBE</i>	<i>Prosopographie chrétienne du bas-empire</i>
<i>PGM</i>	<i>Papyri Graecae Magicae</i>
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
<i>PLRE</i>	<i>Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des études augustiniennes</i>
<i>SBL</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Sources chrétiennes</i>
<i>StPatr</i>	<i>Studia patristica</i>
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>ThSt</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>TLL</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i>
<i>VigChr</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Context and Scholarship.....	1
Chapter One: Vigilantius in His Historical Context.....	6
Chapter Two: Vigilantius as Exegete and Enemy of Jerome.....	19
Chapter Three: Relics and Resurrection.....	37
Text and Translation	57
Commentary.....	75
Chapter I.....	75
Chapter II.....	91
Chapter III.....	99
Chapter IV.....	105
Chapter V.....	114
Chapter VI.....	123
Chapter VII.....	136
Chapter VIII.....	141
Chapter IX.....	148
Chapter X.....	152
Chapter XI.....	157
Chapter XII.....	159
Chapter XIII.....	163
Chapter XIV.....	167
Chapter XV.....	172
Chapter XVI.....	177
Chapter XVII.....	182
Appendix A: Letter 61, written to Vigilantius in 396.....	184
Appendix B: Letter 109, written to Riparius in 404.....	190
Appendix C: The Genre of the <i>Contra Vigilantium</i>	195
Bibliography.....	197

Introduction: Context and Scholarship

Vigilantius of Calagurris, a man with little learning and even less eloquence who was born of low and disgraceful parents,¹ might seem an unlikely adversary for a scholar like Jerome of Bethlehem, one of the four great doctors of the Roman Catholic church; yet he earned Jerome's ire, for he had the gall to declare that celibacy was unnecessary, and relics were no more than specks of dust. Spreading his controversial views, this Gallic native caught the attention of fellow presbyters who grew anxious about his growing influence. These men looked to Jerome for help,² and Vigilantius consequently bore the brunt of scathing attacks in Jerome's *Ep.* 61 and 109 (written in 396 and 404) and in his *Contra Vigilantium* (406).

Vigilantius' Adversary

As a prolific scholar, exegete, politician, and personality, Jerome is one of the best-known men of letters of the late antique period.³ He was born in Stridon, near Dalmatia, in the 340s.⁴ His parents, of whom little is known, were Christians and relatively well-to-do. He had a younger sister, whose name is unknown, and a younger brother named Paulinian. Under the tutelage of the famous grammarian Aelius Donatus, he was educated at Rome before going to

¹ Hier. CV 3 (CCSL 79C, 9) and CV 1 (CCSL 79C, 5).

² Hier. CV 3 (CCSL 79C, 8-9).

³ The scope of this project is to look more closely at the specific time in Jerome's life that involved Vigilantius; detailed information about Jerome's life and career may be sought in several excellent biographies. The standard English biography on Jerome is Kelly, J.N.D. 1975. *Jerome. His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. London; other important works include Grützmacher, G. 1901-8. *Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie zur alten Korchengeschichte*. 3 vols. Leipzig; Cavallera, F. 1922. *Saint Jérôme. Sa vie et son oeuvre*. 2 vols., Louvain/Paris; and Rebenich, S. 1992. *Hieronymus und sein Kreis. Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Stuttgart.

⁴ For the problems with dating, see Booth, A.D. 1979. "The Date of Jerome's Birth." *Phoenix* 33: 346-52, and Kelly, *Jerome*, 337-9. Kelly argues that Jerome was born in 331, which would have made Jerome more than thirty years older than Paulinian.

Trier, where he spent several years (ca. late 360s to the early 370s).⁵ Afterwards, he made his way to Syria, experiencing the monastic life for the first time. Subsequently, he traveled briefly to Constantinople before he returned to Rome in 382.⁶ It was in Rome that he was asked by Pope Damasus to translate the Bible into Latin. It was also in Rome that his lifelong friendships with Paula and Marcella began. His stay at Rome ended abruptly, however,⁷ and in 385 he moved back to the east. He lived out the rest of his years in a monastery in Bethlehem,⁸ and it was at this point in his life that Jerome met Vigilantius.

Previous Scholarship on Vigilantius

Little is known about Vigilantius, and scholars have tried to determine, with varying results, who he was and what his activities were,⁹ but none has yet effectively delved into his writings and how they shed light on the literary pursuits of a religious intellectual during this period. What follows is a brief overview of previous scholarship on the text of the *Contra Vigilantium* and the significance of Vigilantius as a historical figure.

In the last four decades the *Contra Vigilantium* caught the attention of a few scholars.

Ilona Opelt wrote a short book in 1973 on Jerome's invectives, analyzing their ultimately

⁵ This period of time cannot be known with much greater precision. See Kelly, *Jerome* 25-30.

⁶ For his early travels before he arrived in Bethlehem, see Kelly, *Jerome*, 1-128 and Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, 1.1-298. For a brief introduction, see Rebenich, S. 2002. *Jerome*. London: Routledge, 1-40. Each discusses the difficulties in the chronology of Jerome's early life.

⁷ For more on his departure, see Kelly, *Jerome*, 104-115, Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, 1.284-298.

⁸ For his years at Bethlehem, see Kelly, *Jerome*, 129ff., Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, 2.18ff., and Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, 193-208; *ibid.*, *Jerome*, 41-59.

⁹ Several scholars have attempted to provide a narrative of Vigilantius' activities during these years. See Crouzel, H. 1972a. "Saint Jérôme et ses amis toulousains." *BLE* 73: 125-146; *ibid.* 1972b. "Chronologie proposée du prêtre commingeois Vigilance de Calagurris." *BLE* 73: 265-66; Massie, M. 1980. "Vigilance de Calagurris face à la polémique hiéronymienne. Les fondements et la signification du conflit." *BLE* 81: 81-108; Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, 240-51; Perrin, M.Y. 1992. "Ad implendum caritatis ministerium. La place des courriers dans la correspondance de Paulin de Nole." *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Antiquité* 104 (2) 1025-68; and Hunter, D. 1999. "Vigilantius of Calagurris and Victricius of Rouen: Ascetics, Relics, and Clerics in Late Roman Gaul." *JECS* 7 (3): 401-430.

Ciceronian polemical style and structure. She gave a brief paraphrase of each of the chapters of *Contra Vigilantium* and added a few useful references and literary parallels, but offered little explanation of the material, even less of the style of the treatise.¹⁰ In 2002, Stefan Rebenich slightly emended a pre-existing translation of the text.¹¹ A new critical edition (including an in-depth discussion of the complicated manuscript tradition) was published in 2005 in the *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* by Jean-Louis Feiertag. These publications are useful additions to the study of the author and the text, but they provide only a few pages of brief textual notes; none of them offers an in-depth philological and historical commentary.

Vigilantius, in contrast, has long held the interest of religious-historical scholars. His role in what became a defining period in the history of Christianity has not gone unnoticed. In 1844, William Stephen Gilly wrote a historical account of Vigilantius' life set against the religious and political turmoil of the fourth century. While he painted a vivid picture, he could not avoid doing so without keeping his own Protestantism firmly in the foreground. Vigilantius emerged, through Gilly, as "a forerunner of the Reformation."¹² This level of bias hindered greater historical insight, but Gilly's clear respect for Vigilantius shone through.

L.H. Lucassen attempted, in 1960, to sketch the circumstances that led to the foundering of Vigilantius' and Jerome's relationship, but did not add anything substantive to our understanding.¹³ Michel Massie, however, was more successful. His article from 1980 contains several insights into what might have compelled Jerome and Vigilantius to engage in pamphlet warfare with each other - from Jerome's potential Origenism, to arguments over biblical

¹⁰ Opelt, I. 1973. *Hieronymus' Streitschriften*. Heidelberg.

¹¹ *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 6, Ser. 2.

¹² Gilly, W.S. 1844. *Vigilantius and his Times*. London, p. 12.

¹³ Lucassen, L.H. 1960. "De Polemicus Hieronymus Adversus De Priester Vigilantius." *Hermeneus* 32: 53-61.

exegesis.¹⁴ He traced Vigilantius' background, and how Vigilantius ultimately considered Christianity as infected by paganism. The flaw, perhaps, is that Massie looked at Vigilantius largely from the outside; he preferred to probe Jerome's feelings and psyche rather than Vigilantius'. What surfaced in spite of this was a more promising line of investigation surrounding the two opponents than had existed before.

Soon after, Clare Stancliffe, in her 1983 study on Martin of Tours, looked more closely at Vigilantius' relationship with Sulpicius Severus and wrote convincingly about how Vigilantius' moderate views might have been developed in opposition to those of Sulpicius.¹⁵ There was a subsequent crescendo of interest. Dennis Trout wrote about Vigilantius' connection with Paulinus of Nola in 1999 and he suggested that their relationship factored into Paulinus' interactions with Jerome.¹⁶ In the same year, David Hunter sought to contextualize and better understand Vigilantius' role in the ecclesiastical debates of that period.¹⁷ Taking into account the scholarship dealing indirectly with Vigilantius as well as evidence from other texts of the period, Hunter argued for a more objective historical view of Vigilantius. Vigilantius was a member of a conservative faction in Gaul, not a rogue defender of the true faith or a Proto-Protestant.

Hunter's study directly influenced an article by Josef Lössl¹⁸ who stated that, in spite of Jerome's vitriol, he and Vigilantius were more similar than not, especially when both of their

¹⁴ Massie, "Vigilance."

¹⁵ Stancliffe, C. 1983. *St. Martin and His Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

¹⁶ Trout, D. 1999. *Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters, and Poems*. Berkeley: University of California Press, esp. 97-98, 100-101, 220ff.

¹⁷ Hunter, "Vigilantius."

¹⁸ Lössl, J. 2005. "An Early Christian Identity Crisis Triggered by Changes in the Discourse on Martyrdom: The Controversy between Jerome of Stridon and Vigilantius of Calagurris." *More than a Memory: The Discourse of Martyrdom and the Construction of Christian Identity in the History of Christianity*: 97-117.

opinions are compared with the teachings of Victricius of Rouen. Part of Lössl's argument for similarity between the two men was that Jerome did not respond to Vigilantius' beliefs with any clear explanation of his own. Lössl usefully discussed various points at which Jerome *could* have made better arguments/responses to some of Vigilantius' objections. Ultimately, Lössl's thesis that Jerome's lack of theological argumentation seems to be "endorsing Vigilantius' concerns rather than effectively refuting them"¹⁹ was not fully convincing and did not take into account the genre of the treatise. Jerome's aim was primarily to attack Vigilantius, not make logical arguments against him. He stated as much in the treatise and clearly explains the lack of argumentation throughout.²⁰

This brief history of scholarship on Vigilantius and the *Contra Vigilantium* has shown that there is room for more work. Thus, the present study will add to the historical information carefully deduced by previous scholars as well as attempt to disentangle the voice of Vigilantius from the writings of Jerome.

¹⁹ *ibid.*, 117.

²⁰ Hier. CV 17 (CCSL 79C, 30).

Chapter One: Vigilantius in His Historical Context

Vigilantius in Spain, Gaul, and Italy

Only a few late Roman sources besides Jerome mention Vigilantius, but they provide crucial information that can be used as a control in assessing the more tendentious portrayal of Jerome. So, before turning to Jerome, one might begin with the evidence found in other sources. A brief biography is provided by Gennadius of Marseilles, who wrote toward the end of the fifth century CE. Gennadius notes in his *De viris illustribus* that Vigilantius was from Gaul and was an active member of the church:

Vigilantius presbyter, natione Gallus, Hispaniae Barcilonensis parochiae ecclesiam tenuit. Scripsit et ipse zelo quidem religionis aliqua, sed seductus humana laude, et praesumens supra vires suas, homo lingua politus, non sensu Scripturarum exercitatus, exposuit prauo ingenio secundam uisionem Danielis, et alia locutus est friuola, quae in catalogo haereticorum necessario ponuntur. Huic et B. Hieronymus presbyter respondit.

The priest Vigilantius, a Gaul by nationality, presided over the church of a parish in Barcelona in Hispania. And he himself in fact wrote several treatises in his zeal for religion, but was seduced by human praise and took on matters beyond his abilities. He was an eloquent man, but not trained in the understanding of Scripture; he expounded the second vision of Daniel with a perverse understanding, and uttered other frivolities that must needs be placed in the catalogue of heretics. To this man the blessed priest Jerome responded.¹

Gennadius thus indicates that even though Vigilantius was a Gaul by origin, he eventually oversaw a church at Barcelona in Hispania.²

Although the precise chronology is difficult to anchor, it is possible to date some of Vigilantius' activities accurately. W.S. Gilly attempted a much fuller biography, but, as his work

¹ *De vir. ill.* 36 (PL 58, 1078C).

² Gennadius noted that Vigilantius was known for polished speech. Jerome would probably have balked at any suggestion of Vigilantius' eloquence; thus, Gennadius was familiar with Vigilantius independently of Jerome. He clearly had access to other Spanish authors, including Prudentius, Orosius, and Avitus of Braga (*De vir. ill.* 13, 39, and 48).

was itself polemical and less concerned with documentation, it is worthwhile to consider his speculations with a greater eye towards literary and historical evidence.

Of Vigilantius' early years, a few details may be deduced. Gilly guessed that Vigilantius was born in 364; Rebenich put his birth at 370.³ Neither scholar gave a reason for his dating, although an argument can be made against 370. In 395, Vigilantius would meet Jerome as a presbyter, which would mean that, according to Rebenich, he was 25 when ordained, younger than usual.⁴ An earlier date is more probable, given that Vigilantius was unlikely to have had the means and the proper connections in his earlier years to rise quickly through the *cursus honorum* of the church.⁵

Vigilantius was born in Lugdunum Convenarum in Gaul, at the foot of the Pyrenees, a significant stopping point between Gaul and Spain, with a large *mansio*.⁶ If Vigilantius had grown up in that same *mansio*, as the son of an innkeeper,⁷ then he would have had opportunities to meet many important figures, who passed through the area. Gilly also speculated that Vigilantius might have attended two of the councils that met nearby – the Council of Saragossa in 380 and the Council of Bordeaux, which convened in 384. Even if Vigilantius had not attended the Council of Saragossa, he would still have had the chance to meet some of the council's Gallic attendees. Traveling to Saragossa through Lugdunum Convenarum would have

³ Gilly, *Vigilantius*, 125; Rebenich, *Jerome*, 105.

⁴ For instance, c.4 of the Council of Neocaesarea (315) stated that no one under thirty should be ordained as presbyter.

⁵ According to Gilly, Vigilantius had inherited a fortune from his father (130).

⁶ Gilly, *Vigilantius*, 129. See also the Antonine Itinerary which places Calagurris 26 miles from Lugdunum Convenarum (*CSEL* 39, 159-191), and Lizop, R. 1931. *Les Convenae et Les Consoranni*. Vol. 25. Toulouse & Paris: Bibliotheque Meridionale, p. 118, 349-50.

⁷ See CV 1 (*CCSL* 79C, 5) and *Ep.* 61.3 (*CSEL* 54, 579). Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, 246-47, however, stated without much argumentation that Jerome called Vigilantius a *caupo Calagurritanus* (an innkeeper from Calagurris) purely for the sake of invective. See CV 1.10.

been a possible route, perhaps, for Delphinus from Bordeaux⁸ and Foegadius from Agen. They not only attended the council, but were also friends of Paulinus of Nola and Sulpicius Severus, respectively.⁹ Perhaps the friendships between these two men and Vigilantius began at this point through mutual acquaintances.

Like Vigilantius, Paulinus was a Gaul who had moved to Spain. This parallel places Vigilantius more firmly in the possible orbit of Paulinus. Moreover, Paulinus had been ordained as a presbyter by Lampius, bishop of Barcelona on Christmas Day, in 394,¹⁰ and Vigilantius' own church, according to Gennadius, was in Barcelona.¹¹ Might it be too much to suggest that these parallels were more than merely coincidental? That Vigilantius might even have been a friend/client of Paulinus, having met him some time prior to 394, perhaps through mutual friends, who followed his established friend to Spain, and benefited from his patronage to gain a parish of his own there?¹²

By 395, Paulinus spoke fondly about Vigilantius in a letter to Sulpicius Severus, showing that the two men had grown close:

nam **Vigilantius** quoque **noster** in Campania et antequam ad nos perueniret et posteaquam peruenit, ui februm laborauit et aegritudini nostrae, quia et ipse sociale

⁸ He also presided over the Council of Bordeaux; Vigilantius might have attended this council as well.

⁹ Gilly, *Vigilantius*, 132. See the council subscription in Vives, J. et al., eds. 1963. *Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos*. Barcelona-Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Enrique Flórez, p.16. See also Paul. *Ep.* 3.4 (CSEL 29, 17) for his relationship with Delphinus, and Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.44 (CSEL 1, 97) who named a “noster Foegadius.” Also alternately known as Phoebadius.

¹⁰ Paul. *Ep.* 1.10 and *Ep.* 3.4 (CSEL 29, 8-9, 17).

¹¹ Other scholars have assumed that Vigilantius moved to Barcelona *after* Jerome so publicly caviled against him, but the passage from Gennadius does not explicitly suggest this timeline. Cf. Bowes, K. 2005. “‘Une coterie espagnole pieus’: Christian archaeology and Christian communities in fourth- and fifth-century Hispania,” in Bowes, K. and M. Kulikowski, eds. 2005. *Hispania in Late Antiquity: Current Perspectives*. Leiden and Boston, p. 248.

¹² This suggestion contradicts what Trout argued, namely that Paulinus and Vigilantius had crossed paths and knew each other, but that there was not enough evidence to suggest that Vigilantius was a dependent. Trout dismissed Gennadius' testimony about Vigilantius' parish in Barcelona as a potential mistake. See Trout, *Paulinus*, 221.

membrum erat, socio labore compassus est...ergo ut coepit **Vigilantius noster** progredi posse, tum demum censui scripta esse reddenda. fatemur enim ambos multo ante properasse, sed cum ante uirium receptionem temere festinaret qui non poterat, inpie qui ualebat, ambos quia non poteramus uolentes consilio, retinuimus inuitos silentio.

Our Vigilantius, before and after he came to Campania, suffered from serious fever and shared my sickness with his own pains, for he was a limb of the same body... and when **our Vigilantius** began to recover, I finally decided to send you a reply. I confess that both [sc. Vigilantius and his catechumen] have been ready to go for some time. But to rush out before regaining his strength would have been rash for Vigilantius, who was not ready for it, so I detained them both against their wishes with my silence, since I could not keep them willingly with my advice.¹³

This letter places Vigilantius squarely in the social circle of Sulpicius Severus (ca. 363-ca. 425) and Paulinus (ca. 353-431). Paulinus' double description of Vigilantius as "noster Vigilantius" indicates that in a Gallic context Vigilantius could have been viewed quite favorably, as on friendly terms with two of the most influential individuals in the Gallic and Italian churches. This doubtless had an impact on Jerome's view of Vigilantius' importance in the West.

Vigilantius in the East

Jerome corroborated much of the purely objective information in Gennadius and Paulinus and added more information about Vigilantius' activities as a courier: he delivered a letter from Paulinus to Jerome in the east in 395. Jerome even mentioned in *Ep.* 58 that he received "the holy presbyter" enthusiastically,¹⁴ indicating that their acquaintance began in a positive way; however, Jerome wrote that Vigilantius left Bethlehem suddenly, refusing to write a reason why,¹⁵ although Vigilantius probably spent time with Rufinus (ca. 340-410), Jerome's former

¹³ Paul. *Ep.* 5.11 (*CSEL* 29, 32).

¹⁴ Hier. *Ep.* 58.11 (*CSEL* 54, 541): *sanctum Vigilantium presbyterum qua auiditate suscepim* (with what eagerness I received Vigilantius, the holy presbyter).

¹⁵ *ibid.* Jerome wrote that he did not wish to discuss why Vigilantius left so suddenly for fear that he might hurt his feelings (*ne laedere quempiam videar*). Whether the cause was that Vigilantius was found praying naked when an earthquake struck, as described in *CV* 11, remains at most a speculation.

friend, and Melania, Paulinus' relative,¹⁶ on the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem either before or immediately after his visit to Bethlehem. Jerome suspected as much when he later accused Rufinus of negatively influencing Vigilantius' attitude towards him and of being the true orchestrator of the accusations Vigilantius made against him upon leaving Bethlehem.¹⁷ In *Ep.* 61 written in 396,¹⁸ Jerome responded to Vigilantius' accusations with a few of his own,¹⁹ including a strongly worded rejection of Vigilantius' interpretation of a verse in the Book of Daniel that I will discuss in Chapter 2.

After his letter was delivered to Bethlehem, Paulinus' relationship with Jerome began to fade while his relationship with Rufinus came into focus. Vigilantius' involvement in the dissolution of the latter friendship is unclear; however, Trout speculated that Vigilantius brought back to Paulinus at least a summary introduction to Rufinus.²⁰ By 404, Paulinus and Rufinus were very close friends.²¹ With ties to Paulinus, Sulpicius, and Rufinus, Vigilantius would have been difficult for Jerome to ignore.

Vigilantius Returns to Gaul

Vigilantius was not specifically named by any of these authors between 396 and 404; nevertheless, a few oblique references suggest that he began to voice his complaints against asceticism, vigils, and relic worship in Gaul and was gaining supporters. For instance, in the

¹⁶ Paul. *Ep.* 29.5 (CSEL 29, 251).

¹⁷ Nautin, P. 1973. "Études de chronologie hieronymienne." *REA* 19: 69-86 and 213-39, esp. p. 231; Hier. *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 3.19 (CCSL 79, 91). For more on Jerome's reaction to Vigilantius' relationship with Rufinus, see Ch. 2, pp. 33-36.

¹⁸ Kelly, *Jerome*, 206-207.

¹⁹ Jerome also accused Vigilantius of owning a copy of Origen's commentary on Job as well as attacking Jerome's friend, Oceanus, and others of heresy in *Ep.* 61.2-3 (CSEL 54, 577-80).

²⁰ Trout, *Paulinus*, 223.

²¹ Paul. *Ep.* 28.5 (CSEL 29, 245-6).

pseudo-Hieronymian letter *De uiro perfecto*,²² the author described a group of people who spoke out against relics:

Exstiterunt enim qui uirtutes egregias et caelestes per sanctorum reliquias iam utique prope nostris temporibus operantes, maluerunt detractatione mordere, quam ueneratione suscipere...

For there are those who preferred to attack with slander than to receive with veneration the outstanding heavenly deeds that work now, nearly in our own times, through the relics of holy men...

Based on Courcelle's suggestion that this letter was written by Eutropius, an Aquitanian priest, around 400, it is probable that Vigilantius, or those who supported him, was the target.²³

Furthermore, in 402/3, Exsuperius, bishop of Toulouse, erected a basilica to St. Saturninus, after initially hesitating to move the saint's remains to their new location.²⁴ Because of Exsuperius' hesitation, Hunter concluded that Vigilantius' anti-relic rhetoric must have been influential in the area, especially in conjunction with Riparius' report to Jerome that the bishop of Vigilantius' diocese was paying attention to the presbyter's teachings.²⁵

In addition to Vigilantius' influence on Exsuperius, Sulpicius, according to Stancliffe, also responded to Vigilantius. His former friend's polemic served as "one context" for the *Dialogues* and the *Chronicles*²⁶ written between 404-6.²⁷ One of the passages cited as evidence is *Chron.* 2.51:

²² *Ep.* 6.11, *ad amicum aegrotum* (PL 30, 92A-B).

²³ Courcelle, P. 1954. "Un nouveau traité d'Eutrope, prêtre aquitain vers l'an 400." *REA* 56: 377-90. See also Feiertag (2005b, xxx-xvi); Stancliffe, *St. Martin*, 274-75.

²⁴ *Passio St. Saturnini* in Ruinart, P. 1859. *Acta martyrum*. Ratisbone: G. J. Manz, 175-80.

²⁵ Hunter, "Vigilantius," 409-10. *Ep.* 109.2 (CSEL 55, 353).

²⁶ Stancliffe, *St. Martin*, 306-7. She suggests that their relationship probably ended by 403. *Chron.* 2.51, 8-10 (CSEL 1.105); *Dial.* 3.18 (CSEL 1.216).

²⁷ *ibid.*, *St. Martin*, 80-1.

et nunc, cum maxime discordiis episcoporum omnia turbari ac misceri cernerentur cunctaque per eos odio aut gratia, metu, inconstantia, inuidia, factione, libidine, auaritia, arrogantia, somno, desidia deprauata, postremo plures aduersum paucos bene consulentes insanis consiliis et pertinacibus studiis certabant: inter haec plebs Dei et optimus unus quisque probro atque ludibrio habebatur...

And now, when all things are considered confused and confounded, especially with the discord of the bishops, and through them everything was corrupted by hate or favoritism, fear, inconstancy, jealousy, partisanship, lust, greed, pride, sleep, and idleness, at last, many people with insane plans and stubborn practices were fighting against the few men of good counsel...

While Vigilantius might well have been among those involved in the discord between Gallic bishops, more specific information is lacking.²⁸ However, Stancliffe's argument that the *Dialogues* were written in part to defend Jerome's orthodoxy against accusers (like Vigilantius) strengthens her reading that Sulpicius had Vigilantius in mind.²⁹

Even without these potential references to Vigilantius in Gaul after 396, his name appears again in 404. Jerome received a letter from Riparius, a Gallic presbyter and friend, who had informed him that Vigilantius was preaching against the worship of relics and was execrating vigils.³⁰ After inspiring one of Jerome's most vicious attacks, the *Contra Vigilantium*, in 406, Vigilantius is not mentioned again by name. Jerome did, however, exsecrate a certain hot-headed heretic in his *Comm. in Is.*, written between 408-10:

omnesque haeretici, quales nuper sub magistro cerebroso in Gallia pullularunt, qui basilicas martyrum declinantes, nos qui ibi orationes ex more celebramus, quasi immundos fugiunt. Hoc autem non tam illi faciunt, quam habitantes in eis daemones, fortitudinem et flagella sancti cineris non ferentes.

All the heretics, of the sort that recently sprouted in Gaul under a hot-headed teacher, turn away from the basilicas of the martyrs and run away from us as though we are unclean,

²⁸ "Somnus" very quietly suggests a pun.

²⁹ Stancliffe, *St. Martin*, 307-11.

³⁰ Hier. *Ep.* 109 (CSEL 55, 351-56).

we who customarily pray there. However, they do not do this so much as the demons dwelling in them, not enduring the powerful whips of the holy ash.³¹

The rhetoric in this passage coincides so closely with that in the *Contra Vigilantium* and Jerome is clearly thinking of Vigilantius as one of these heretics, and most probably as the “*magister cerebrosus*” himself.³² Although Vigilantius’ specific activities were not mentioned after the *Contra Vigilantium*, it is clear that neither he nor his supporters instantly retreated beneath Jerome’s attack.

Table of Events

Year/Time period	Vigilantius’ activities
360s	Birth
380	Possibly at the Council of Saragossa
384	Possibly at the Council of Bordeaux
394-5	Ordained by Paulinus in Barcelona
395	With Sulpicius at Primuliacum Meets Jerome in Bethlehem Meets Rufinus in Jerusalem
396	In Gaul, near Toulouse
400-6	Starts speaking against relics; soon after starts speaking against vigils, asceticism

Who was Vigilantius? Vigilantius as Writer

Jerome characterized Vigilantius as a poor exegete and stylist. His success at the former will be discussed in the following chapter. As for the latter, what may be learned about Vigilantius’ style and how do the two authors compare? In this section, the style of both authors

³¹ *Comm. in Is.* 18.65.4 (CCSL 73A, 747).

³² *ibid.*

is juxtaposed to show that Jerome cared about *how* he was going to respond and that Vigilantius, despite Jerome's accusations, was also a worthy stylistic opponent.

Jerome claimed to have been in a hurry, but the modesty *topos* does not lessen the obvious rhetorical polish characteristic of his writing.³³ Evident throughout the treatise is Jerome's preference for parallel structures. By structurally equating two ideas or clauses, Jerome can either increase the sentiment in the second clause to build intensity or shine a brighter light on their differences. For example, in 6.3, Jerome found it difficult to believe that, according to Vigilantius, the souls of martyrs remain fixed and unable to move: *Tu deo leges pones, tu apostolis uincula inicies...*? The two questions have the same word order, the same number of words, with the asyndeton and anaphora highlighting their direct juxtaposition. What comes into relief is the increasing pent-up indignation that is characteristic of much of this work, found in the increase in syllables from two to three/four. To different effect, Jerome defended the seemingly idolatrous manner of Christian worship in 7.10: *Illud fiebat idolis et idcirco detestandum est, hoc fit martyribus et ideo recipiendum est*. As in the previous example, the same word order, isocolon, etc. What become clear are the differences between the two otherwise similarly arranged clauses.³⁴

Jerome also was in conformity with Behaghel's law of increasing members to similar effect, rhetorically capturing the bile rising within him in response to Vigilantius' offensive

³³ CV 3.5, 17.1-2. For studies on Jerome's style, see Hritz, J.N. 1939. *The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome*. Catholic University of America; Hagendahl, H. 1958. *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*. Göteborg: Almqvist & Wiksell; Conring, B. 2001. *Hieronymus als Briefschreiber. Ein Beitrag zur spätantiken Epistolographie*. Tübingen: JCB Mohr.

³⁴ Other examples include 8.1: *secundum nos ossa ueneranda, secundum te uile puluisculum*; 8.5: *eadem contra nos loquaris quae ille contra ecclesiam loquitur*; 13.8: *non in auaritiam, sed in refrigerium, non ad diuitias congregandas, sed ad imbecillitatem corpusculi sustentandam et frigus atque inedia declinandam...non solum apud nos, sed etiam apud Hebraeos... non ut aliis refrigerium et aliis sit tribulatio, sed ut aliorum abundantia aliorum sustentet inopiam*; 14.7: *metens carnalia et seminans spiritalia*.

statements. Many instances of this can be seen in the examples already listed, to which can be added the hissing “*eas aestimas respuendas*” of 9.2, where Jerome succinctly reduced Vigilantius’ views on how relics should be treated.³⁵ There are also examples of chiasmus,³⁶ asyndeton,³⁷ anaphora,³⁸ alliteration,³⁹ paracheisis,⁴⁰ and zeugma.⁴¹

In addition to rhetorical devices, Jerome’s style also exhibits prose-rhythm.⁴² Although attention to rhythm was not a universal practice among prose authors, it was commonly employed by Cicero, whose example would have a lasting influence.⁴³ In his writing, the most favored *clausulae* are the catalectic double cretic (– – – x) often with resolution in the second long syllable (– – – – x), double cretic (– – – – x), and the cretic ditrochee (– – – – – x).⁴⁴ The legacy of Ciceronian *clausulae* did not disappear from Late Antique writers even though

³⁵ Cf. 5.3: *deo debitus deferretur*.

³⁶ 12.6: *qui pudicitiam uultu praeferunt et pallida iugi continentia ora portantes, Christi ostendunt uerecundiam*.

³⁷ 1.6: *damnandas dicat esse uigilias et numquam nisi in Pascha alleluia cantandum, continentiam haeresim, pudicitiam libidinis seminarium*.

³⁸ 9.8: *Non uigilemus itaque diebus Paschae, ne expectata diu adulterorum desideria compleantur, ne occasionem peccandi uxor inueniat, ne maritali non possit recludi clauē*.

³⁹ 1.11: *psalmorum modulatione mulcetur*.

⁴⁰ 13.8: *reuoluere uoluero*.

⁴¹ 11.2: *et tunica et fides nudus*.

⁴² See Scourfield, J. H. D. 1993. *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome’s Letter 60*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 233-242. He offers a brief and eminently useful introduction to prose-rhythm as well as Jerome’s attention to it in *Ep.* 60, with some comparisons with other letters.

⁴³ For seminal works on Classical prose-rhythm, see Groot, A.W. de. 1919. *A Handbook of Antique Prose-rhythm*. Groningen: The Hague; Zielinski, Th. 1914. *Der constructive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden*. Leipzig: Dieterich. For more recent work, especially on the prose-rhythm of later authors, see Oberhelman, S.M. 1988a. “The *Cursus* in Late Imperial Latin Prose: A Reconsideration of Methodology.” *CP* 83: 136-49; *ibid.* 1988b. “The History and Development of the *Cursus Mixtus* in Latin Literature.” *CQ* 38: 228-42.

⁴⁴ Scourfield, *Consoling*, 234.

metrical *clausulae* began to be replaced by accentual rhythms (the *cursus*).⁴⁵ The most dominant rhythms are the *cursus planus* (ó o o ó o), the *cursus tardus* (ó o o ó o o), the *cursus uelox* (ó o o o o ó o), and the *cursus trispondaicus* (ó o o o ó o).

Jerome did not always compose his works with an eye to rhythm, but the *Contra Vigilantium* reveals that he followed the *cursus mixtus*, a modern term used to describe the observance both of quantitative and accentual rhythms. For instance, the *planus* often occurs with the cretic spondee, the *tardus* with the double cretic, and the *uelox* with the ditrochee, although Jerome admitted more variety.⁴⁶ In the first chapter of the *Contra Vigilantium* the *cursus mixtus* appears frequently:

Multa in orbe monstra generata sunt: centauros et sirenas, ululas et onocrotalos in Esaia legimus. Iob Leuiathan et Behemoth mystico **sermónē dēscrībīt** (*planus* / cretic spondee). Cerberum et stymphalidas aprumque erymanthium et leonem nemeaeum, chimaeram atque hydram multorum capitum narrant **fābŭlāe pōētārŭm** (*uelox* / cretic spondee). Cacum describit Vergilius. Triformem Geryonem **Hispāniāe prōdīdērŭnt** (*uelox*/ditrochee). Sola Gallia monstra non habuit, sed uiris semper fortibus et **eloquentīssīmīs ābŭndāuīt** (*uelox* / cretic spondee)...Dum inter phialas philosophatur et ad placentas ligurriens psalmodum modulation mulcetur, ut tantum inter epulas Daud et Idithun et Asaph et filiorum Chore cantica **audīrē dignētŭr** (*planus* / cretic spondee). Haec dolentis magis effudi animo quam ridentis, dum me cohibere non possum et iniuriam apostolorum ac martyrum surda nequeo **aurē trānsīrē** (*planus* / cretic spondee).

Other examples abound in the text⁴⁷ and further showcase Jerome's style and skill in punctuating each sentence's end.

The text of the *Contra Vigilantium* does not consist entirely of Jerome's paraphrases, however. Although the sample is scarce, there are several verbatim citations in the treatise from

⁴⁵ See note 65.

⁴⁶ Scourfield, *Consoling*, 235-236.

⁴⁷ E.g. 16.16-17: Matres uocamus sorores et filias et non erubescimus uitiis nostris nomina **pietātīs ōbtēndērē** (*tardus* / double cretic). Quid facit monachus in **cēllŭlīs fēmīnārŭm** (*uelox* / ditrochee)? Every chapter has several varieties of the *cursus mixtus*, although the *planus* or *uelox* / cretic spondee occurs most frequently.

which Vigilantius' style may be examined.⁴⁸ If Jerome's opinion were taken as gospel, Vigilantius' writing would be dismissed as unintelligible rubbish.⁴⁹ Yet, the citations reveal a style that aims to be polished. To speak generally, if that is possible, about Vigilantius' style, he too knew how to write polemic. This is clear almost immediately from his use of the diminutive, "*pulvisculum*" and the disdainful "*nescio quod*" to describe relics:

4.6: Prope ritum gentilium uidemus sub praetextu religionis introductum in ecclesiis: sole adhuc fulgente moles cereorum accendi, ut ubicumque **pulvisculum nescio quod** in modico uasculo pretioso linteamine circumdatum osculantes adorent.

Jerome certainly used diminutives in a similar way, referring to Vigilantius' writings as a "*commentariolus*" (6.17). Vigilantius also made use of *distinctio* to make an important point about the nature of the respect people accorded relics:

4.4: Quid necesse est tanto te honore **non solum honorare, sed etiam adorare** illud nescio quid quod in modico uasculo transferendo colis?

Another feature that appears more than once in the short extant samples suggests Vigilantius' preference for constructions with anaphora and asyndeton in conjunction with a crescendo of cola:

15.1: Si omnes se reclauserint et fuerint in solitudine, **quis** celebrabit ecclesias, **quis** saeculares homines lucrifaciet, **quis** peccantes ad uirtutes poterit cohortari?⁵⁰

Note how Vigilantius also was careful to vary the position of the verb to counter the static position of the subject in anaphora. These examples, however brief, reveal a writer who valued style.

⁴⁸ There is not enough information, however, to do what Paul Monceaux could for Faustus in Augustine's *Contra Faustum*. Monceaux, P. 1933. "Le Manichéen Faustus de Milev. Restitution de ses capitula." *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 43: 1-112.

⁴⁹ 3.5: *sermone inconditus*. See also *Ep.* 61.3: *Scilicet et gloriari cupis, et in patria tua iactitas, me non potuisse respondere eloquentiae tuae, et acumen in te Chrysippi formidasse... Solus es Cato Romani generis disertissimus, qui testimonio tuo et prudentiae uelis credi.*

⁵⁰ Cf. also 4.7: *Magnum honorem praebent huiusmodi homines beatissimis martyribus, quos putant de uilissimis cereolis illustrandos, quos agnus qui est in medio throni cum omni fulgore maeistatis suae illustrat.*

Even in the handful of verbatim citations, prose-rhythm is evident, although without more context for each quotation it is impossible to anchor how well he used them. The following list contains examples of Vigilantian prose-rhythm:

4.4: ...in modico uasculo **trānsfērēndō cōlīs** (no *cursus* / double cretic)

8.3: ...si aliquis **precātōr āduēnērīt** (*tardus* / double cretic)

15.1: ... quis **celebrābīt ēcclēsīās** (*tardus* / double cretic), quis saeculares homines
lucrificiet, quis peccantes a uirtutes **pōtērīt cōhōrtārī** (*uelox* / cretic spondee)

Even from such limited data, it is clear that Vigilantius' writing was the product of a rhetorical education; he was not "sermone inconditus." Perhaps he did not meet Jerome's standards, but then no enemy of Jerome's could.

Chapter Two: Vigilantius as Exegete and Enemy of Jerome

Jerome took what he believed would be his parting shot. Hardly any time had passed since Jerome had hosted Vigilantius at his monastery in Bethlehem. He had welcomed his visitor and treated him like a brother, but how was he repaid? An abrupt departure followed by an outrageous accusation that he was an Origenist! By writing a scathing letter, Jerome expected to convince every reader that Vigilantius' opinions on religious matters were not to be taken seriously. To demonstrate this, he paraphrased Vigilantius' exegesis of a passage from the Book of Daniel and called it heretical. Was it?

Approach

This chapter will examine how Vigilantius fitted into the culture of exegesis and religious debate during the years in which he is attested (395-406). To situate him in the late fourth/early fifth century more fully than has been done before, it will refer to contemporary documents and literature, thereby contextualizing his exegetical work. The chapter will focus on the text of the exegesis (Daniel 2:34, 45), the tenability of Vigilantius' interpretation and its connection to Origenism, and, lastly, how Jerome reacted to Vigilantius' accusations of Origenism. This will be shown by looking at Jerome's later treatment of Vigilantius in the *Contra Vigilantium*, and to the feud between him and Rufinus.

Vigilantius and the Book of Daniel

a) The background

More than dates, places, and people can be uncovered through the sources that discussed Vigilantius. Gennadius noted that was Vigilantius known not only for his polished speech,¹ but also for his incorrect exegesis of the Book of Daniel. Jerome attacked Vigilantius' interpretation

¹ Genn. *De vir. ill.* 36 (PL 58, 1078C).

of Daniel in *Ep.* 61, supporting part of Gennadius' claim about Vigilantius' literary and exegetical activities. It is with the exegesis of a verse in the Book of Daniel that this section begins; for a clear way to determine how Vigilantius fit into the literary context of this period is to understand how he understood the bible.²

The primary topic of *Ep.* 61 may help to explain why Jerome chose to paraphrase Vigilantius' exegesis. Writing in 396, Jerome was defending himself against Vigilantius' accusations that he was an Origenist.³ The tone and the language in this letter reflect the very recent outbreak in the east of hostility to Origen's supporters.⁴ He described Vigilantius' charge:

Unde satis miror te uoluisse Origenis mihi obicere dogmata, cuius in plerisque errorem usque ad hanc aetatem penitus ignoras. Egone hereticus? Et cur me, quaeso, heretici non amant? Tu orthodoxus?

For this reason, I rather marvel that you wanted to reproach me with Origen's doctrines, of whose error in many cases you, yourself, are quite unaware even to this day. Am I a heretic? Then why, I ask, do heretics not love me? Are you orthodox?

In response to this accusation, Jerome listed some of Origen's heretical teachings,⁵ and stated that he anathematized his errors daily. But he did not discount the great contribution Origen had made to the study of Scripture. For this reason, Jerome wrote that he read as much as he could, while discounting the aspects that were heretical. Jerome in turn accused Vigilantius of owning books of Origen's that also contained some heretical material. While other exegetes like

² For more on Jerome's as well as other interpretations of Daniel, see Braverman, J. 1978. *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel. A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible*. Washington: The Catholic Bible Association.

³ The accusations (in whatever form they appeared) are no longer extant. However, Jean-Louis Feiertag (2005b) recently discussed a possible independent witness to Vigilantius' question to Jerome about why he still read Origen.

⁴ Kelly, J.N.D. 1975. *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. New York: Harper & Row, pp. 195-209. See also Clark, E.A. 1992. *The Origenist Controversy. The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

⁵ Jer. *Ep.* 61.2 (CSEL 54, 577): *Errauit de resurrectione corporis; errauit de animarum statu, de diaboli paenitentia et - quod his maius est - filium et spiritum sanctum seraphin esse testatus est.*

Eusebius of Vercelli and Victorinus of Petavium had been able to use the good and disregard the errors within Origen's works, surely Vigilantius, with a background working in a tavern, did not have the ability to do the same.⁶ After all, how could Vigilantius be an expert both in bartending and in expounding Scripture? At the close of his letter, Jerome criticized Vigilantius' exegesis, thereby providing a very rare glimpse into Vigilantius' work:

Inter ceteras quippe blasphemias, quas ore sacrilege protulisti, ausus es dicere montem, de quo abscisus est in Danihelo lapis sine manibus, esse diabolum et lapidem Christum, qui adsumpsit corpus Adam, qui diabolo ante per uitia cohaeserat, natum esse de uirgine, ut a monte, hoc est a diabolo, hominem separaret. O praecidendam linguam ac per partes et frustra lacerandam! Quisquamne Christianus deum patrem omnipotentem in persona diaboli interpretatur et tanto piaculo totius orbis aures maculat?

In fact, among the other blasphemies you brought forth with your sacrilegious mouth, you dared to say that the mountain in Daniel from which the stone was cut without hands is the devil, and that the stone is Christ, who, having taken the body of Adam (who had clung to the devil before through his sins), was born from a virgin to separate mankind from the mountain, that is, from the devil. Your tongue should be cut out and torn into bits and pieces! Does any Christian read into God the Father Almighty the character of the devil and defile the ears of the whole world with such wickedness?⁷

Jerome attacked Vigilantius' interpretation instantly, finding it unworthy of a detailed rebuttal.

He responded only that the mountain was an obvious symbol of God and closed his letter:

Si interpretationem tuam, quisquam non dicam catholicorum, sed haeticorum, siue gentilium umquam recepit, pium sit quod locutus es. Sin autem tantum nefas numquam audiuit Christi ecclesia et per tuum primum os, ipse se montem interpretatus est, qui dixerat: "*Ero similis altissimo*," age poenitentiam, in sacco uersare et cinere, et tantum scelus iugibus absterge lacrimis. si tamen tibi dimittatur haec impietas et iuxta errorem Origenis tunc veniam consequaris, quando consecuturus est et diabolus, qui numquam plus quam per os tuum deprehenditur blasphemasse.

If *anyone* (I do not mean just Catholics, but heretics or heathen!) has ever accepted your interpretation, then let what you said be considered pious; however, if the church of Christ has never heard such impiety, and if through your mouth first he interpreted

⁶ Hier. Ep. 61.2-3 (CSEL 54, 577-79).

⁷ Ep. 61.4 (CSEL 54, 581-82). This passage takes place in the second year of King Nebuchadnezzar's reign. The king had had a dream in which a stone was cut from a mountain and struck a colossal statue; Daniel came before him to explain the dream's import.

himself as the mountain, who once said: “*I shall be similar to the Most High*,” then repent, roll in sackcloth and ashes, and cleanse your great impiety with constant tears, if you should still be forgiven this impiety and, according to the error of Origen, you should obtain pardon at that future time, when even the devil will obtain it, who has never been caught blaspheming more than through your lips.

Instead of examining Vigilantius’ thoughts in greater detail, Jerome wrote that the exegesis was impossible to accept and not to be found elsewhere. Furthermore, Jerome turned the accusation of Origenism back onto his opponent by linking him with one of Origen’s most controversial beliefs; for, as Origen said, even the devil may repent and be forgiven.

With this riposte, Jerome might have believed that he had put Vigilantius’ exegesis (and his accusations of Origenism) to bed; but he was not entirely successful. Gennadius also wrote that Vigilantius was known for his interpretation of Daniel.⁸ Both sources criticize the exegesis as wrong, but neither discusses why. The following sections investigate contemporary exegesis to contextualize Vigilantius’ interpretations; in addition, there are Origenist elements in Vigilantius’ exegesis that Jerome did not respond to because he was more preoccupied in protecting and promoting his own reputation for orthodoxy.

b) The text

In order to understand Vigilantius’ interpretation, this particular passage in the Book of Daniel will be traced through the various stages to its fourth century reception. Of the texts in existence at the time, Jerome took special interest in working from the original Hebrew, or Aramaic in this particular case.⁹ In the preface to his translation of Daniel, Jerome informed his readers that:

⁸ *De vir. ill.* 35 (PL 58, 1078C).

⁹ See Lacocque, A. 1979. *The Book of Daniel*. London: SPCK, pp.13ff. He discusses the possible reasons for why Daniel 2:4b through Daniel 7 are in Aramaic while the rest of the text is in Hebrew.

Danielem prophetam iuxta Septuaginta Interpretes Domini Saluatoris Ecclesiae non legunt utentes Theodotionis editione, et hoc cur acciderit, nescio. Siue enim quia sermo Chaldaicus est, et quibusdam proprietatibus a nostro eloquio discrepat, noluerunt Septuaginta Interpretes easdem linguae lineas¹⁰ in translatione seruare: siue sub nomine eorum ab alio nescio quo non satis Chaldaeam linguam sciente, editus liber est: siue aliud quid causae exstiterit ignorans: hoc unum affirmare possum, quod multum a ueritate discordet, et recto iudicio repudiatus sit.

The churches of our Lord, the Savior, do not read the prophet Daniel according to the Seventy interpreters, using Theodotion's version instead. Why this happened, I do not know. Whether it was because the language is Aramaic, which differs in certain ways from our speech, and the Seventy interpreters did not wish to preserve the same verbal connections of language in the translation, or that the book was published in their name by someone who did not know Aramaic adequately, or if there was some other reason, I do not know. I am able to affirm this one thing: that translation differs greatly from the truth, and has been rightly rejected.¹¹

Theodotion's text for the verses (Dan. 2:34, 45) is as follows:

34: ἐθεώρεις, ἕως οὗ ἀπεσχίσθη λίθος ἐξ ὄρους ἄνευ χειρῶν καὶ ἐπάταξε τὴν εἰκόνα ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας τοὺς σιδηροῦς καὶ ὀστρακίνους καὶ ἐλέπτυνεν εἰς τέλος

34: You saw, until a stone was cut **out of a mountain** without hands, and it struck the image upon its feet of iron and clay, and completely reduced it

45: ὃν τρόπον εἶδες ὅτι ἀπὸ ὄρους ἐμήθη λίθος ἄνευ χειρῶν καὶ ἐλέπτυνε τὸ ὄστρακον, τὸν σίδηρον, τὸν χαλκὸν, τὸν ἄργυρον, τὸν χρυσόν

45: You saw that **out of a mountain** a stone was cut without hands, and it reduced the clay, the iron, the brass, the silver, the gold¹²

Both verses, interestingly, contain the phrase “from the mountain,” although it appears in 2:45 alone in the Masoretic Text.¹³ However, of verse 45, the *Anchor Bible* commentator Louis

¹⁰ TLL s.v. *linea* 1437.80-1438.35.

¹¹ (PL 28, 1291).

¹² Ziegler, J. 1939. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 2.107, 110-11. See also Di Lella, A. 2001. “The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel,” in J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint, eds. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, Vol. 1, 586-607. Leiden: Brill.

¹³ 34: דִּי חֲזִית-דִּי קַבֵּל-כָּל מָה; וְהִדְקָתָהּ; וְחִסְפָּא פְּרוּלָא דִּי רַגְלוֹהִי-עַל לְצַלְמָא וּמַחַת, בִּידִינוּ לֹא-דִי אֲבוּ הַתְּגִגְרָת דִּי עַד, הָוִית חֲזָה לָד: 45: דִּי חֲזִית-דִּי קַבֵּל-כָּל מָה; לְמַלְכָּא הַיּוֹדֵעַ רַב אֱלֹהִי--וְיִדְהָבָא פְּסָפָא חִסְפָּא נְחָשָׁא פְּרוּלָא וְהִדְקָתָהּ, בִּידִינוּ לֹא-דִי אֲבוּ אֶתְגִּגְרָת אֲמִשְׁתָּר, חִלְמָא וְנִצִּיב; דְּמָה אֲחֵרִי לְהָוָא דִּי מָה, הָוִית חֲזָה לָד: פְּשָׁרָה וּמַהִימָן.

Hartman remarks that the same phrase “is not given in the description of the vision [in 2:34], and so it may be a later addition here, perhaps suggested by the description of the stone itself becoming a great mountain in verse 35.”¹⁴ In other words, the stone cut “from the mountain” in verse 45 could have been added by analogy from verse 35, and “from the mountain” in verse 45 at some point could have entered verse 34 of Theodotion’s text. Through Jerome’s lens, one might argue that the disputed phrase was insignificant relative to the rest of the description of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream. After all, he did not find it worthy of exegesis in his commentary.¹⁵

c) The mountain as the devil

For Vigilantius to interpret the stone as Christ was nothing new; other exegetes of Daniel understood it the same way and biblical parallels also supported their interpretations.¹⁶ For instance, Firmicus Maternus, in 350, wrote explicitly about the difference between Mithras, born of a rock, and Christ, stating that Christ, the holy stone, unites body and soul:

Lapis autem hic sanctus, id est, Christus aut fidei fundamenta sustentat, aut in angulo positus, duorum parietum membra aequata moderatione conjungit, id est, ueteris et noui Testamenti in unum colligit gentes: aut certe corporis et animi diuersitatem inuiolata homini immortalitate consociat; aut legem promulgat, aut contra peccantes testimonium perhibet; aut quod est potius imaginem diaboli percutit, ut, superato eo atque prostrato, et in cinerem fauillasque conuerso, erecto sublimitatis suae uertice, purum dominationis imperium habeat.¹⁷

He refers specifically to the statue of Daniel 2. But what about the mountain? While exegetes have the option to interpret a passage from the bible in many ways, positive or negative,¹⁸ the

¹⁴ AB 23: 141. 2:35: *lapis autem qui percusserat statuam factus est mons magnus et impleuit uniuersam terram* (the stone that had struck the statue became a great mountain and completely filled the earth).

¹⁵ Hier. *Comm. in Dan.* (CCSL 75A, 795, 847).

¹⁶ e.g. 1 Cor. 10:4, Eph. 2:20, Ps. 118:22, Acts 4:11.

¹⁷ Firm. Mat. *De err.* 20 (PL 12, 1028B-29A).

¹⁸ e.g. Augustine contrasts two of the possibilities in *Enarr. in Ps.* 45.7 (CCSL 38, 522): *alii sunt enim montes dei, alii sunt montes saeculi: montes saeculi, quibus caput diabolus; montes dei, quibus caput christus* (Some mountains

content of the passage in question seems to support an *in bonum* interpretation of the mountain. That the stone was cut without hands was generally understood as Christ born of a virgin, even by Vigilantius (*natum esse de uirgine*); that the stone was cut from a mountain suggests further information on Christ's parentage or provenance. In the *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchaeus*, the mountain was Mary;¹⁹ Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 263-339) believed the mountain to be the word of God;²⁰ Hilary of Poitiers (ca. 300-368) understood the mountain as God;²¹ Augustine (354-430) agreed and also added the possibility that the mountain was a symbol of Israel;²² Jerome clearly felt that the mountain could only have symbolized God,²³ his primary disagreement with Vigilantius' exegesis. That Vigilantius chose to interpret the mountain as the devil would appear, in comparison with these other authors, a minority opinion.

Vigilantius, however, was not alone. In the *De fide* of Ambrose (ca. 337-397), completed in 380, Ambrose argued against Arians who proposed, in brief, that Christ was dissimilar to God and that they were not of the same substance. In 3:14, he stated that the Father and the Son are the same and explained through different biblical examples the meaning of the word "substance." Ambrose cited Nahum 2:6, "The gates of the cities are broken, the mountains are fallen, and his substance is revealed"²⁴ and interpreted the mountains as "high things that exalt themselves."²⁵

belong to God, some mountains belong to heathens – the head of which is the devil; as for the mountains of God, their head is Christ).

¹⁹ *Dial.* 114 (CPG 2301).

²⁰ Eus. *Comm. in Isaiam* 1.26, 93 (GCS Eusebius 9).

²¹ Hil. *Tract. Ps.* 124.3 (CCSL 61B, 52).

²² Aug. *Enarr. Ps.* 120.4 (CCSL 40, 1789), 124.4 (CCSL 40, 1837-38); 98.14 (CCSL 39, 1391).

²³ Hier. *Ep.* 61.4 (CSEL 54, 541).

²⁴ Ambr. *De fide* 3.14.115 (CSEL 78, 148): *Portae ciuitatum fractae sunt, montes ceciderunt et reuelata est substantia.*

He then explained that the word in the Greek text was “kingdoms,” which is another term for “mountains,” and, because mountains mean “high things that exalt themselves,” “kingdoms” can be identified with Satan:

Denique in Graeco, regna ceciderunt, habetur. Quae regna, nisi satanae, de quo dixit Dominus: Quomodo stabit regnum ipsius? Ipsos ergo legimus **montes, quae regna sunt diaboli**. Ideoque istis cadentibus regnis de corde fidelium, revelatum est paternae Dei Filium Christum esse substantiae.

Moreover, the Greek says: "The kingdoms are fallen." What kingdoms, if not those of Satan, of whom the Lord said: "How will his kingdom stand?" We understand, therefore, the mountains themselves, which are **the devil's kingdoms**. Therefore when those kingdoms fall from the hearts of the faithful, the truth stands revealed, that Christ, the Son of God, is of the Father's [eternal] substance.²⁶

His argument provides a very clear parallel to Vigilantius' interpretation. The point is that Ambrose, a well-known and contemporary exegete, identified Satan with mountains in a different context. Thus, this part of Vigilantius' exegesis was attested and was not his personal idiosyncrasy.

d) Satan – body of man – Christ

Looking at contemporary literature and exegesis is also useful in comparing how others, in addition to Vigilantius, discussed the relationship between the devil, Christ, and man in metaphorical terms in the context of excommunication. In his treatise *De paenitentia*, Ambrose argued for the possibility of repentance, even for the grievously fallen:

uenit in uirga, quia a communione sacra conuictum remouit, - et bene dicitur **tradi Satanae qui separatur a Christi corpore**, - uenit etiam in caritate spirituque mansuetudinis, uel quia sic tradidit ut spiritum eius saluum faceret, uel quia eum quem ante sequestrauerat, postea sacramentis reddidit.

He came with a rod, because he separated the guilty man from holy communion, - and he **who is separated from the body of Christ** is rightly said to be handed over to **Satan**, -

²⁵ Ambr. *De fide* 3.14.116 (CSEL 78, 149): *Montes ergo sunt altitudines se extollentes*.

²⁶ *ibid.* 3.14.117 (CSEL 78, 149).

Christ came in love and in the spirit of gentleness either because he handed him over in such a way to save his spirit, or because he restored to the sacraments the one he had separated before.²⁷

Ambrose then discussed how sinners could return, after having been separated, through the redemption that Christ provides. Augustine also discussed how repentance could undo one's separation from Christ:

ergo qui egerit ueraciter poenitentiam, et solutus fuerit **a ligamento quo erat constrictus et a Christi corpore separatus**, et bene post poenitentiam uixerit, sicut ante poenitentiam uiuere debuit, post reconciliationem quandocumque defunctus fuerit, ad deum uadit, ad requiem uadit, regno dei non priuabitur, **a populo diaboli separabitur**.

So those who have done genuine penance, and have been absolved from the bond by which **they were bound and cut off from the body of Christ**, and have lived good lives after their penance, such as they ought to have lived before penance, and in due course have passed away after being reconciled, why, they too go to God, go to their rest, will not be deprived of the kingdom, **will be separated from the people of the devil**.²⁸

In both passages, man's physical bond to Satan is broken through repentance and Christ's redemption. Vigilantius' words are provided once more to compare the similarities:

... Christum, qui adsumpsit corpus Adam, **qui diabolo ante per uitia cohaeserat**, natum esse de uirgine, ut **a monte, hoc est a diabolo, hominem separaret**.

... Christ, who, having taken a body from Adam (**who had clung to the devil before through his sins**), is born from a virgin **to separate mankind from the mountain, that is, from the devil**.²⁹

The language and the imagery the authors employed similarly depict how man's separation from the devil is possible only through repentance and through Christ. The next section argues that Jerome might have read into Vigilantius' exegesis elements from Origen that can explain Jerome's dismissive treatment.

²⁷ Ambr. *De paen.* 1.15.78 (CSEL 73, 156).

²⁸ Aug. *Serm.* 393 (PL 39, 1714).

²⁹ Hier. *Ep.* 61.4 (CSEL 54, 581).

e) Jerome's disagreement with Vigilantius

In his *Ep.* 61, Jerome expressed astonishment that Vigilantius could have accused Oceanus, Vincentius, Paulinianus, and Eusebius of Cremona,³⁰ members of Jerome's party in the Origenist controversy. Jerome also accused Vigilantius of owning a copy of Origen's works on Job.³¹ Whether this charge was groundless or not, Jerome, at the very least, wanted to foreground the accusation in his letter. Curiously, he did not specifically mention that Vigilantius' interpretation could have been influenced by Origen; for instance, a passage from one of the extant fragments on Jeremiah:

ὁ διάβολος ὄρος ὠνόμασται, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ζαχαρία· τίς εἶ σύ, τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα τὸ πρὸ προσώπου Ζοροβάβελ; Καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἔχοντος κωφὸν καὶ ἄλαλον δαιμόνιον ἔλεγεν ὁ σωτήρ· ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ· μετάβηθι, καὶ μεταβήσεται. ὄρος οὖν ὁ διάβολος ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδίας διεφθαρμένον κακίας καὶ διαφθεῖρον τοὺς ὅσοι φρονοῦσι τὰ γήϊνα

The devil is called a mountain, as in Zechariah: “Who are you, great mountain, in the face of Zorobabel?” And concerning the one who has the deaf and dumb demon, the Savior said, “If you have faith as a grain of mustard seed, you will say to this mountain: ‘Move away,’ and it will move away.” **Thus the devil is the mountain** destroyed by his own evil and destroying all who have their minds set on earthly things.³²

In this passage, Origen interpreted the mountain in Zechariah 4:7 as the devil – an *in malum* interpretation, unlike the reading of Didymus the Blind who saw the mountain as a symbol for Christ.³³ A stronger and more interesting connection lies in the rest of the verse in Zechariah:

τίς εἶ σύ, τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα, πρὸ προσώπου Ζοροβαβελ τοῦ κατορθῶσαι;
καὶ ἐξοίσω τὸν λίθον

³⁰ *Ep.* 61.3 (CSEL 54, 579).

³¹ *Ep.* 61.2 (CSEL 54, 577). Clark called Vigilantius, along with Theophilus of Alexandria, a “turncoat” during the controversy, starting off as a friendly acquaintance of Jerome, and ending up as an alleged supporter of Rufinus, Jerome's political enemy (*Origenist*, 35).

³² Orig. *Fr. in Jer.* 41 (GCS 6, 199-232).

³³ Did. Caec. *Comm. in Zech.* 1.300 ff. (SC 83).

Who are you, great mountain, in the face of Zorobabel? You shall become a plain and **he will bring out the stone**³⁴

The passage in Zechariah is crucial for the idea of the stone (a good thing) coming out of the evil mountain. In a letter accusing Vigilantius of Origenism, the fact that Jerome did not mention this passage is suggestive; he might have wished to tar Vigilantius with this brush while avoiding any direct mention of Origen's exegesis. Jerome, in his own commentary on Zechariah, was noncommittal:

montem autem plerique nostrorum, diabolum interpretantur, et Antichristum, qui coram Zorobabel, de quo nasciturus est Christus, stare audeat, et se erigere.

A great number of us interpret the mountain as the devil and the Antichrist who, in the face of Zorobabel, where Christ was going to be born, dares to stand and raise himself up.³⁵

Jerome did not specify who these interpreters were. His use of *nostrum* at times referred to fellow Latin exegetes, including himself,³⁶ but he also wrote of "*plerique nostrorum*" as a group with which he did not necessarily agree.³⁷ Also, if he had really wanted to highlight his argument that Vigilantius could not be a competent enough scholar to adapt Origenist interpretations selectively, this would have been an obvious place for attack, especially as Jerome considered the interpretation of the mountain in Zechariah as the devil erroneous.³⁸ Perhaps it was the case that Jerome did not mention any of these connections because he did not wish to reveal any more specific knowledge on his own part of the heretical portions of Origen's texts and exegesis. It

³⁴ Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, 13.1.

³⁵ Hier. *Comm. in Zach.* (CCSL 76A, 780).

³⁶ For example, Hier. *Comm. in Is.* 7.19 (CCSL 73A, 284).

³⁷ *ibid. Comm. in Zach.* 1.2: nostrorum autem plerique referunt ad caelestem Hierusalem, et hanc dicunt iterum extruendam, quae ruina animarum peccatricum fuerat destituta. hoc haeretici suspicentur; *Ep.* 133.2: neque nunc mihi necesse est ire per singulos sanctrum et quasi in corpore pucherrimo naeuos quosdam et maculas demonstrare, quod plerique nostrorum simpliciter faciunt, cum paucis sententiolis scripturarum possint hereticorum et per eos philosophorum argumenta conuinci.

³⁸ *ibid. Comm. in Zach.* 1.4 (CCSL 76A, 780).

had only been a couple of years since he openly rejected Origen and he certainly would not have wanted to draw any more attention to the accusations against him.³⁹ Thus, instead of responding to Vigilantius' exegesis, Jerome closed his letter with a final, bitter joke against one of Origen's more controversial interpretations, leaving no doubt as to Jerome's opinion of him. He told Vigilantius to consider repenting – for, according to Origen, even the devil can repent and be saved.⁴⁰

Jerome's unwillingness to betray specific knowledge about Origen continues after *Ep.* 61. After writing it, he also responded to an Origenist reading of Jonah 3:6-9⁴¹ writing that certain people, followers of Origen, maintained that the king of Nineveh, who repents and is forgiven at the end of the world, was really the devil:

Scio plerosque regem Niniue...super diabolo interpretari, qui in fine mundi (quia nulla rationabilis, et quae a Deo facta sit, creatura pereat) descendens de sua superbia, acturus sit poenitentiam, et in locum pristinum restituendus. Ad cuius sensus comprobationem etiam illud de Daniele exemplum proferunt: ubi Nabuchodonosor, acta per septem annos poenitentia, in regnum pristinum restituitur. Sed hoc quia sancta Scriptura non dicit, et euertit penitus timorem Dei, dum facile homines labuntur ad uitia, putantes etiam diabolum, qui auctor malorum est, et omnium peccatorum fons, acta poenitentia, posse saluari, de nostris mentibus abiciamus. Et sciamus peccatores in Evangelio mitti in ignem aeternum

I know that many people interpret the king of Nineveh as the devil, saying that he, at the end of the world (on the grounds that no rational creature made by God should perish), descending from his pride, would repent, and be restored to his former place. They even provide that passage from Daniel to prove this interpretation: when Nebuchadnezzar, having repented for seven years, is restored to his former kingdom. But, because Holy Scripture does not say this, and this interpretation thoroughly overturns the fear of God so long as people easily fall into sin, if they think that even the devil, the originator of evils

³⁹ The reason for Jerome's sudden condemnation of Origen has puzzled scholars. Kelly, *Jerome*, 198 wrote that Jerome wanted to appease Epiphanius, a staunch oppose of Origen. See also Vessey, M. 1993. "Jerome's Origen: The Making of a Christian Literary Persona." *StPatr* 28: 135-45.

⁴⁰ *Ep.* 61.4 (CSEL 54, 582).

⁴¹ Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, 1.2, 44; Grützmacher, *Hieronymus*, 1.101.

and the source of all sins, can be saved if he repents, let us cast this out our minds. And let us recognize that in the Gospel, sinners are sent into eternal fire.⁴²

Jerome again did not call special attention to the identity of the “plerosque” for this specific passage in Jonah, proving further that he was still as apprehensive as he had been when responding to Vigilantius.

Many years later, in the *Contra Vigilantium*, Jerome chose once again to defend his orthodoxy while arguing against Vigilantius’ questionable understanding of key biblical texts. In CV 6, he stated that Vigilantius made use of 4 Ezra 7:102-5 to argue against the efficacy of intercessory prayers:

Dicis in libello tuo quod dum uiuimus, mutuo pro nobis orare possumus. postquam autem mortui fuerimus, nullius sit pro alio exaudienda oratio, praesertim cum martyres ultionem sui sanguinis obsecrantes impetrare non quierint...et proponis mihi librum apocryphum, qui sub nomine Esdrae a te et similibus tui legitur; ubi scriptum est, quod post mortem nullus pro aliis audeat deprecari; quem ego librum nunquam legi. Quid enim necesse est in manus sumere, quod ecclesia non recipit?

You say in your little pamphlet that while we live, we are able to pray for one another reciprocally; after we have died, however, one’s prayer on behalf of another cannot be heard. This is especially true since the martyrs, even though they pray for someone to avenge their blood, are unable, according to you, to get what they desire... and you recommend to me this apocryphal book that is read by you and those like you under the name of Esdras. In this book, it was written that after death, no one would dare to pray for others. Of course, I have never read this book - why should I take up in my hands what the church does not recognize?⁴³

Jerome’s main goal was to dismiss those who used apocrypha to support their heretical beliefs. A closer look at the passage in 4 Ezra 7 shows, as in the case of the Daniel passage, that Jerome could have made an argument against Vigilantius’ interpretation:

Si inueni gratiam ante oculos tuos, demonstra mihi adhuc seruo tuo, si in die iudicii iusti impios excusare poterint uel deprecari pro eis Altissimum, si patres pro fillis uel filii pro parentibus si fratres pro fratribus, si adfines pro proximis, si fidentes pro carissimis. Et

⁴² Hier. *Comm. in Ionam* (CCSL 76, 406-408), on Jonah 3.6-9.

⁴³ CV 6 (CCSL 79C, 14-15).

respondit ad me et dixit: Quoniam inuenisti gratiam coram oculis meis, et hoc tibi demonstrabo. Dies iudicii audax est et omnibus signaculum ueritatis demonstrans. Quaemadmodum nunc non mittit pater filium uel filius patrem aut dominus seruum uel fidus carissimum, ut pro eo intellegat aut dormiat aut manducet aut curetur, sic numquam nemo pro aliquo rogabit; omnes enim portabunt unusquisque tunc iniustitias suas aut iustitias.

If I have found favor in your eyes, make clear to me, your servant, if on the Day of Judgment the just will be able to intercede for the wicked or to plead with the Most High on their behalf – fathers for sons, or children for parents, or brother for brothers, relatives for next of kin, and friends for those dearest [to them]. He responded to me and said: Because you have found favor in my eyes, I will make it clear to you. The Day of Judgment is decisive, making clear to all the seal of truth. Just as now a father cannot delegate to a son, or a son to a father, or a master to a slave, or a friend to one dearest [to him], to be sick for him, or to sleep or to eat or to be restored to health, so nobody can pray for another, for all will bear, each, then, his own injustice or justice.⁴⁴

Several problems arise after comparing this passage with Vigilantius' argument above. There is some confusion about who may intercede for whom and when; Vigilantius, mediated by Jerome, understood the passage to mean that the dead may not pray for the living, stating firmly that the souls of martyrs and saints reside in fixed places and do not serve as mediators between God and those who pray. He interpreted the Ezra passage, which refers to End Time, and applied it to Interim Time, which is incorrect. Jerome argued that the dead should be able to intercede: surely martyrs could not have *less* power after they have received their crowns of victory.⁴⁵ But he could have easily cited the rest of the Ezra passage to argue against Vigilantius' reading. A few verses later (4 Ezra 7:106-112) the text states that the living may pray for one another in present time; the Day of Judgment, however, is the end of time for mortals, at which point the souls of the dead may not pray for the souls of other dead. Thus, Jerome could have argued that

⁴⁴ 7:102-5. Weber, R. 2007. *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, p. 1948.

⁴⁵ CV 6 (CCSL 79C, 14): If apostles and martyrs, still in corporeal form, are able to pray for others when they ought to be concerned with their own welfare, how much more should they do so after their crowns, their victories and their triumphs? See Box, G.H. 1913. "IV Ezra," in R.H. Charles, ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2.542-624. Oxford: Clarendon Press. He presumes that Jerome's objection to the passage led to its removal from many copies of Latin manuscripts (590).

Vigilantius distorted or simply misunderstood the overall point of the passage by applying its conclusion, that the prayers of the dead are not heard at all at End Time, to suit his discourse against the power of martyrs in Interim Time. But Jerome made no use of this potential correction; instead, his unwillingness to have any association with an apocryphal text prevented him from using it to his advantage, much as he was unwilling to use Origen's comments on the passage in Jonah against Vigilantius' exegesis of the verse in Daniel.

Moreover, Vigilantius' relationship with Rufinus may have been an underlying cause. Jerome, in his *Apologia adversus Rufinum*, accused Rufinus of negatively influencing Vigilantius, who, shortly after meeting Rufinus, called Jerome an Origenist.⁴⁶ So, Jerome picked up his literary cudgel and attacked the two-headed hydra with one blow. He said as much in his *Apologia (ego in Vigilantio tibi respondi)*.⁴⁷ In fact, how much of *Ep.* 61 was written with Rufinus in mind? Jerome quoted an accusation that Rufinus made against him:

testimonium de scripturis in eum tam iniuriose posuisti ut ego id repetere meo ore non audeam

You [Jerome] have so wrongfully used a passage from Scripture against [Vigilantius] that I dare not repeat it with my lips.⁴⁸

While it is not certain to which passage Rufinus referred, he might have been alluding to Jerome's paraphrase of Vigilantius' exegesis. Still, further evidence suggests that *Ep.* 61 was meant for Rufinus' eyes. The men whom Vigilantius was said to oppose (Oceanus, et al.)⁴⁹ were

⁴⁶ Hier. *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 3.19 (CCSL 79, 91).

⁴⁷ In this way, it would seem that Jerome was protecting his reputation for orthodoxy where he was most influential – in the east, and that he was not especially interested in looking for greater exposure in Gaul, even if as a champion against Origen.

⁴⁸ Hier. *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 3.19 (CCSL 79, 91).

⁴⁹ *ibid.* *Ep.* 61.2 (CSEL 54, 577).

also enemies of Rufinus.⁵⁰ Among the unorthodox teachings of Origen that Jerome criticized, he listed as the most important the fact that, in Origen's commentary on Isaiah, the Seraphim mentioned by the prophet are the divine Son and the Holy Ghost.⁵¹ Some scholars found it curious that Jerome would choose this as the most grievous of Origen's unorthodox beliefs. But Rufinus discussed the very same issue in his *Apologia* against Jerome, written in 401.⁵² It is not unreasonable to assume that, given their long history, this could have been a long-standing subject of disagreement.

Lastly, in his *Apologia* against Jerome there is evidence to suggest that Rufinus, too, understood that *Ep.* 61 was partly directed against him. In 61.2, defending himself against the charges of Origenism, Jerome wrote that other scholars were able to deploy Origen's texts selectively. He added:

taceo de Victorino Petobionensi et ceteris, qui Origenem in explanatione dumtaxat scripturarum secuti sunt et expresserunt, **ne non tam me defendere quam socios criminis uidear quaerere.**

I am silent about Victorinus of Petavium and others who merely followed and imitated Origen in his explanations—those of scripture at least, **lest I seem not to defend myself but rather seek allies in my crime.**

Rufinus, in *Apol.* 2.40, wrote of how Jerome would, at will, choose whether he would condemn or make use of Origen:

si illius exemplo iudicari uis, relege sententias tuas et uide quid dixeris: hoc non est - inquis - **se defendere, sed socios criminis quaerere.** Noli ergo et tu **socios criminis** quaerere, sed purgationem facti require.

If you wish to be judged by that man's example, reread your judgment upon him, and see what you have said. You say, **"This is not to defend oneself but to seek companions in**

⁵⁰ Hier. *Ep.* 83.1 (*CSEL* 55, 119-20) and *Ep.* 81.1-2 (*CSEL* 55, 106-7).

⁵¹ *ibid.* *Ep.* 61.2 (*CSEL* 54, 577).

⁵² Ruf. *Apol. adv. Hier.* 2.27 (*PL* 21, 607A).

one's crime." Do not, therefore, seek companions in your crime, but find a way to justify your behavior.⁵³

There is no other instance in which Jerome used "socios criminis quaerer," and it is clear that Rufinus meant to remind Jerome of what he had said concerning Origen years earlier in 396 as well as to insinuate that Jerome had found his *socii*.

The connection between Rufinus and Vigilantius might still have been at the forefront of Jerome's invective several years later when he wrote the *Contra Vigilantium*. In CV 6, Jerome told Vigilantius to read some of these unusable texts in the company of weaving women. He had used this insult before in his *Apologia adversus Rufinum*. Here, Jerome wondered why Rufinus was heaping so many accusations upon him:

qui parturis mihi montes criminum, et gladios quos defigas in iugulum meum tanto ante tempore exacuis...ut panegyricum tuum per angulos et plateas ac **muliercularum textrina** recitarent?

You bring forth mountains of accusations against me and sharpen these swords to pierce my throat. ... Was this to recite your panegyrics in every corner, every street, even in the **weaving shops of women**?⁵⁴

While Jerome often recycled phrases, biblical citations, and insults, he used this particular phrase only three times, in these two cases and one other time in a letter to Pammachius (*Ep.* 57.3), insulting those who criticized his translation of Epiphanius' letter to John. It is important to recall that Epiphanius' letter was intended to convince Bishop John and his allies (including Rufinus) formally to renounce Origen. Jerome hinted near the end of the letter (57.12) that the sources of the criticisms were certain instructors, assumed to be Rufinus and Melania.⁵⁵ Furthermore, Jerome, some sections after the passage above, also alluded to Rufinus' negative influence on

⁵³ Ruf. *Apol. adv. Hier.* 2.36 (PL 21, 614B).

⁵⁴ Hier. *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 3.3 (CCSL 79, 75-76).

⁵⁵ *Ep.* 57.12 (CSEL 54, 525): *non est illius culpa, cuius sub persona alius agit tragoediam, sed magistrorum eius, qui illum magna mercede nihil scire docuerunt.* Kelly, *Jerome*, 203.

Vigilantius;⁵⁶ thus, the use of the same insult may be intentional and meant to be seen by Rufinus as well. The repetition may suggest that Jerome viewed Vigilantius through the negative lens of his rivalry with Rufinus ten years after Vigilantius had accused Jerome of Origenism.

Vigilantius' associations with Jerome's opponents, like Rufinus, Paulinus of Nola, and Sulpicius Severus, were never far from Jerome's mind.

Conclusion

A considerable amount about Vigilantius has been extracted and extrapolated from Gennadius of Marseilles' entry and the small collection of Jerome's writings. The juggernaut of Jerome's smear-campaign probably succeeded; however, Jerome's attacks have (ironically) helped to reconstruct who Vigilantius was. Not only have his exegetical activities been explored, but his relationship with Jerome and how he engaged him has been more fully developed.

Vigilantius was not a minor heretic, nor was he simply a bad exegete; he was an active member of an influential group in the western church, a group that opposed Jerome with regard to what would become important doctrines.

⁵⁶ Hier. *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 3.19 (CCSL 79, 91).

Chapter Three: Relics and Resurrection

In 1847, a brief tale circulated about an old gentleman ringing the Liberty Bell to mark the Second Continental Congress' vote for independence on July 4, 1776. Although the story was apocryphal, the bell gained celebrity and became a visible, tangible symbol of American freedom. As such, the bell traveled throughout the country so that Americans could be near it and perhaps even touch it; hence, its distinctive crack lengthened as fragments broke away through travel-damage and the hands of people who wanted to own a piece for themselves.¹ Vigilantius would have disapproved.

This chapter continues to situate Vigilantius in contemporary religious debates by examining his beliefs about the resurrection, which affected his views on relics. It will also establish that Vigilantius departed from Jerome's position on resurrection at the same time that he began publicly to accuse Jerome of Origenism in 396; hence, his negative view of the cult of relics. Then, Vigilantius' protests will be situated within the larger discussions concerning relic veneration. His reactions to other forms of worship, carrying/kissing relics and lighting candles during the day, will conclude the chapter.

The Resurrection Body

If Vigilantius' beliefs about the worship of martyrs were not in line with Jerome's and his supporters', where did that leave him? Other scholars have tried to pinpoint certain historical events that might indicate when Vigilantius' position on asceticism and the worship of relics changed. Griffe argued that in Toulouse, where Vigilantius was living at this time,² the growth of St. Saturninus' cult, culminating in the building of his church in 402 or 403, may have increased

¹ Nash, G.B. 2010. *The Liberty Bell*. New Haven: Yale University Press, p. 42ff. and 80.

² The assumption that Vigilantius was in Toulouse at the time was based on the concern of Jerome's Tolosan friends who had written asking for his help. For Jerome's friends from Toulouse, see Crouzel, "Saint Jérôme," 125-146.

Vigilantius' distaste for the worship of saints.³ Hunter suggested that Vigilantius' position against the worship of relics was fully developed prior to the building of Saturninus' church, arguing that Exsuperius, the bishop, hesitated to bring Saturninus' relics to Toulouse in response to Vigilantius' polemic.⁴ Hunter's argument for an earlier date is the more probable because of Exsuperius' clear hesitation. Jerome also made a claim about Vigilantius' belief in the resurrection in 396. If one believed in a spiritual resurrection, one's attitude towards the physical body after death would have had to be different from that of someone who believed in a physical resurrection. Who believed in which?

Among the early church fathers, resurrection was often described as a material and natural process.⁵ Just as God created the minute elements that gave rise to a fully-grown human being, so, too, would he raise him from these very remains after death. To believe otherwise would be tantamount to questioning the power of God, so Justin argued in the 2nd century.⁶ Theophilus of Antioch wrote that resurrection is similar to the recovery of an invalid;⁷ Tertullian, too, in many of his works stressed a material continuity, writing that the resurrection body was like a repaired ship, rising completely whole, *integer*.⁸ Of course, many writers cite Jonah vomited from the whale intact, or Daniel, escaping from the lion's den unharmed.⁹ The

³ Griffe, *La Gaule*, 3.226-30. Cf. Crouzel, "Saint Jérôme," 135-38.

⁴ Hunter, "Vigilantius," 409-10.

⁵ For a thorough chronological treatment, see Bynum, C. 1995. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

⁶ *I Apol.* 19. Athenagoras of Antioch also made a similar argument (*Res.* 17.2-4).

⁷ *Ad Autolycum* 1.13.

⁸ *De res.* 57. For a general introduction, see Evans, E. 1960. *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection*. London: SPCK., pp. ix-xxxv.

⁹ Jonah 2:10; Dan. 6:16.

overwhelming similarity between these authors is the belief that the body will rise, in the very same flesh, reassembled as it was before.

The next generation of scholars continued this discussion. Origen had an original approach, focusing more on spiritual than material continuity. He used 1 Cor. 15:50-52 to aid his explanation of resurrection:

hoc autem dico fratres quoniam caro et sanguis regnum Dei possidere non possunt neque corruptio incorruptelam possidebit, ecce mysterium vobis dico omnes quidem resurgemus sed non omnes inmutabimur, in momento in ictu oculi in novissima tuba canet enim et mortui resurgent incorrupti et nos inmutabimur

I declare to you, brothers and sisters, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable. Listen, I tell you a mystery: We will not all sleep, but we will all be changed. In a flash, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed.¹⁰

This passage was used to support Origen's view that one's resurrection body would be spiritual. It could not be physical, when one takes into account the drastic changes that mark any living being; the body after death must similarly change and cannot rise as it was.¹¹

For Jerome, however, the body must remain intact and reassembled exactly as it had been while alive.¹² Although his eschatological beliefs are difficult to pin down for they were reactive and contextual,¹³ it is possible to isolate consistent ideas that run through his works. For instance, Jerome is very clear in his belief that the resurrection body is physical. In the aftermath of the Origenist controversy, Jerome wrote the treatise *Contra Johannem* to refute John of Jerusalem's writings about resurrection and accused him of being an Origenist. He does so by pointing to all

¹⁰ Weber, *Biblia*, 1787. Or. *De princ.* 2.3.7, 272; *ibid.* Or. 26.6, 363.

¹¹ See Or. *De princ.* 2.10 and *Contra Celsum* 5.18-19.

¹² Jerome discussed resurrection at length in *CJ*, *Apol. adv. Ruf.*, *Ep.* 84, and *Ep.* 108.

¹³ See O'Connell, J.P. 1948. *The Eschatology of Saint Jerome*. Mundelein: Saint Mary on the Lake.

of the instances where John wrote about the *resurrectio corporis*, but nowhere mentions *resurrectio carnis*.¹⁴ Surely this was evidence of prevarication on John's part.¹⁵

On the one hand, Jerome was trying primarily to malign John; however, Jerome's focus on resurrection and what happens to the body is not merely a source for polemic – he wrote about this topic in a variety of places and it is clear that, for a time, the fate of the body was at the forefront of his mind. Even in 396, Jerome wrote in *Ep.* 61 that Vigilantius once believed, as he himself did, in a physical resurrection. Jerome states:

recordare, quaeso, illius diei, quando me de resurrectione et ueritate corporis praedicante ex latere subsultabas et adplodebas pedem et orthodoxum conclamabas.

Recall, I ask, that day when you were almost jumping at my side as I preached about the resurrection and the reality of the body, stamping your feet and praising my orthodoxy.¹⁶

According to Jerome, up until the writing of this letter, Vigilantius believed in a bodily resurrection. Whether he continued to do so is not explicitly stated, but what is left unsaid suggests that he changed his mind.¹⁷ The focus of the entire letter also suggests that what changed Vigilantius' mind was Origen.

Earlier in the letter, Jerome accused Vigilantius of owning a now lost commentary that Origen wrote on Job: *cur tractatus eius in Iob descriptos habes?*¹⁸ In addition to the controversial ideas Origen had about the devil,¹⁹ Vigilantius would also have been exposed to Origen's

¹⁴ Bynum, *Resurrection*, 87.

¹⁵ *CJ* 25.

¹⁶ *Ep.* 61.3 (CSEL 54, 579).

¹⁷ In *Ep.* 109, Jerome accused Vigilantius of considering bodies unclean, a common opinion among those who did not believe in a bodily resurrection. He made a similar accusation in *CV*.

¹⁸ *Ep.* 61.2 (CSEL 54, 577).

¹⁹ Further in 61.2: *In quibus contra diabolum et de stellis coeloque disputans quaedam locutus est, quae ecclesia non recipit?* Possibly in reference to Job 1-2 and 25.

explanation about the rest of Job, especially Job 14.²⁰ The entire chapter deals with Job's questions about his mortality and the afterlife. From what is known about Origen, his views on this chapter would have been in line with those in his other works; passages in the Bible speak to an understanding of bodies that are in flux.²¹ Augustine, in his *Adnotationes in Iob*, corroborates this possible interpretation and explains that Job 14:18 refers to the evolution of the human body.²² In the hands of Origen, the conclusion might have been that the resurrection body could not be the same as it was while living and is, therefore, in opposition to Jerome.²³ If Vigilantius owned a copy of Origen's commentary, he would have been aware of this interpretation; he certainly was not opposed to adopting Origenist readings of other passages of the Bible.²⁴ Thus, the fact that he is said to have read Origen on Job might date his change of opinion concerning the resurrection body to 396.

While Vigilantius' views might have been positively affected by reading Origen, he might also have been influenced by contemporary sources preaching in favor of relics as a symbol of resurrection. One such contemporary author was Victricius of Rouen. In his *De Laude Sanctorum*, delivered in 396, a sermon he wrote to thank Ambrose who had sent him some relics, he explained that, no matter the size, every relic was just as powerful as another, because each

²⁰ Of special interest may be Job 14:18-19: *mons cadens defluet et saxum transfertur de loco suo/ lapides excauant aquae et adluuione paulatim terra consumitur*. Perhaps Jerome had this in mind when he decided to focus in on Vigilantius' exegesis of the Daniel passage.

²¹ E.g. *Contra Celsum* 5.18: Οὔτε μὲν οὖν ἡμεῖς οὔτε τὰ θεῖα γράμματα αὐταῖς φησι σαρκί, μηδεμίαν μεταβολὴν ἀνελιηφύαις τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον, ζήσεσθαι τοὺς πάλαι ἀποθανόντας, ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀναδύντας.

²² Aug. *Ad. in Iob* 14.18: *et quidem mons cadens defluit: ita et homo ex altitudine et firmitate sua cecidit. et petra ueterascit in loco suo: ut homo in genere suo et condicione sua.*

²³ See O'Connell, *Eschatology*, 54-59 and Bynum, *Resurrection*, 86-94.

²⁴ See Ch. 2, pp. 19-36.

piece is connected by the power of the saint's blood. He continued to preach that the power of the relics was proof of a bodily resurrection:

Si diuisas esse reliquias diceremus a spiritu, merito omnis uiscerum nexus et soliditas quaereretur. At uero cum unitam aduertamus esse substantiam, ab re est, totum in toto perquirere. Iniuria unitatis est, maioris inquisitio potestatis...aeternitatis insignia edita esse, etiam sanguis ostendit, qui ignem Spiritus sancti adhuc signat in ipsis corporibus reliquiisque membrorum.

If we were saying that relics were divided from the spirit, we would be right to look for all the connection and solidity of body parts. But when we realize that the substance is united, it follows that we are searching for the whole in the whole. Looking for a greater power is an offense against unity... even the blood shows that they are presented as signs of eternity, the blood which is still the sign of the fire of the Holy Spirit in the very bodies and relics of the limbs.²⁵

To Victricius, relics of the saints are whole, even in their minute small pieces; martyrs' bodies and souls are inseparable; thus, martyrs are present in their relics. Vigilantius disagreed on the location of martyrs' souls. In the *Contra Vigilantium*, Jerome paraphrases Vigilantius' position:

Ais enim uel in sinu Abrahae uel in loco refrigerii uel subter aram dei animas apostolorum et martyrum consedisce nec posse suis tumulis et ubi uoluerint adesse praesentes.

You say that the souls of the apostles and the martyrs have come to rest either in the lap of Abraham, or in a place of refreshment, or under the altar of god and that they are unable to leave their tombs and be present where they wish.²⁶

²⁵ *DLS* 10. Further in c.12: *iungantur reliquiae; iungantur et gratiae, in unum conueniant, primae resurrectionis exordia*. For an introduction, translation, and more thorough explanation of Victricius' theology, see Clark, G. 1999. "Victricius of Rouen : « Praising the Saints »." *JECS* 7 (3): 365-399; *ibid.* 2001. "Translating Relics: Victricius of Rouen and Fourth-Century Debate." *EME* 10 (2): 161-176.

²⁶ *CV* 6.1.

Their souls are distinct from their bodies and are not always present in their relics; therefore, their bones are no more than bones and not worthy of worship. These beliefs directly contradict what Victricius believed, and, given the timing of his *De Laude Sanctorum* (396), it is possible that Vigilantius knew him or his work through Paulinus.²⁷ With the Origenist controversy behind Vigilantius' sudden feud with Jerome, it is clear that Vigilantius' stance on both resurrection and relic worship began to form around this time, and not later.

The Spread of Relic Cult

By the time Vigilantius entered the debate, worshiping relics and visiting martyrs' tombs had already begun.²⁸ Even the translation of martyrs' remains began half a century earlier. In 351-4, Constantius Gallus transferred the bones of Saint Babylas to Daphne and built a church there. The translation met with great disapproval from pagans who blamed the relics for polluting the area and rendering silent the local oracle of Apollo.²⁹ Veneration and dispersal of martyrs had also become more common. For instance, Basil of Caesarea wrote *On the Holy Martyrs* about how, in the 370s, many towns had their share of the 40 martyrs of Sebaste.³⁰

It was not until over a decade later, however, that Ambrose became the catalyst for a new phase in relic veneration. In the west especially, there was still fear of miasma through the late

²⁷ Victricius was certainly known to Paulinus and Sulpicius Severus at the time when Vigilantius was still his courier (Paul. *Ep.* 18, *Ep.* 37; Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* 3.2).

²⁸ Martyr cult has been treated widely and with great depth. The following list of relevant secondary scholarship is by no means exhaustive but each serves as an introduction to the variety of research done on the topic. Grabar, A. 1972. *Martyrium: recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique* (2 vols.); Delehay, H. 1933. *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Vol. 20). Société des Bollandistes; Saxer, V. 1980. *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*. Paris: Beauchesne; Brown, P. 1981. *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*; Angenendt, A. 1994. *Heilige und Reliquien: Die Geschichte ihres Kultes vom frühen Christentum bis zur Gegenwart*. CH Beck.

²⁹ Soz. *Hist. Eccl.* 5.19; Cf. Greg. Naz. *Contra Iulianum* 1.25; See Lieu, S. 1989. *The Emperor Julian: Panegyric and Polemic*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, p.48. Soon afterwards followed the translation of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy (see CV 5). See Delehay, *Les origines*, 54-68.

³⁰ (PG 31, 521).

fourth century. Long-accepted attitudes towards the polluting nature of corpses did not vanish immediately as the population of Christians grew.³¹ Both groups felt uneasy about removing and transporting remains because of concerns over pollution as well as laws against violating tombs.³² Yet, instead of adhering to the decrees that forbade moving and distributing bones, in 386 Ambrose found and installed the relics of Gervasius and Protasius at the new basilica in Milan and began sending fragments to other colleagues such as Victricius of Rouen.³³ Although Ambrose's action was politically motivated, and the legitimacy of the relics was met with what Vigilantius would have deemed an appropriate amount of skepticism,³⁴ its effects went far beyond the political sphere.

By installing the relics of these local martyrs, Ambrose made relics, especially those of local martyrs, a necessary possession for Christian communities. Unfortunately, as Paulinus of Nola, remarked, martyrdoms did not occur everywhere:

Nam quia non totum pariter diffusa per orbem
Prima fides ierat, multis regionibus orbis
Martyres abfuerant

For because faith was not equally diffused throughout the world, martyrs had been absent from many regions³⁵

³¹ For a discussion of the pagan influence on Christian attitudes towards the dead, see Brown, *Cult*, especially 6-8, 26-30. For pollution in ancient Greek society, see Parker, R. 1990. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

³² *CTh* 9.17. See Rébillard, E. 2009. *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 57-88. Laws also attest further concerns about selling relics. Also, in the *Apostolic Constitutions* 6.30, the author tried to argue that the dead did not pollute and that Christians had a right to take care of their dead and mourn for them. On the laws affecting burial and relics, see Harries, J. 1992. "Death and the Dead in the Late Roman West," in S. Bassett, ed. *Death in Towns: Urban Responses to the Dying and the Dead, 100-1600*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, pp. 56-67.

³³ Ambr. *Ep.* 22; Vict. *DLS*; Paul. *Ep.* 32.17.

³⁴ McLynn, N. 1994. *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley: University of California Press, p.213.

³⁵ Paul. *Carm.* 19.317-19 (*CSEL* 30, 129).

Consequently, communities without martyrs believed that they needed to acquire relics of their own, the demand for non-local relics began to increase, and distributing them became a common and accepted practice for increasingly more Christians.

Context: Who Spoke against Relic Veneration?

a. Pagans

Against this backdrop of increasing translations and the founding of martyria throughout the Christian world, a couple of well-known pagans wrote against relic worship³⁶ in the latter half of the fourth century.³⁷ The Emperor Julian made very clear his feelings about relics when he removed those of Babylas from Daphne;³⁸ he also wrote specifically against Christians who seemed to worship martyrs at their tombs:

πάντα ἐπληρώσατε τάφων καὶ μνημάτων, καίτοι οὐκ εἴρηται παρ' ὑμῖν οὐδαμοῦ τοῖς τάφοις **προσκαλινδεῖσθαι** καὶ περιέπειν³⁹ αὐτούς. εἰς τοῦτο δὲ προεληλύθατε μοχθηρίας, ὥστε οἶεσθαι δεῖν ὑπὲρ τούτου μηδὲ τῶν γε Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου ῥημάτων ἀκούειν. ἀκούετε οὖν, ἃ φησιν ἐκεῖνος περὶ τῶν μνημάτων· οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι παρομοιάζετε τάφοις κεκονιαμένοις· ἔξωθεν ὁ τάφος φαίνεται ὡραῖος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμει ὀστέων νεκρῶν καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας.⁴⁰ εἰ τοίνυν ἀκαθαρσίας Ἰησοῦς ἔφη πλήρεις εἶναι τοὺς τάφους, πῶς ὑμεῖς ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν θεόν;

You have filled everything with tombs and memorials, and yet it is nowhere said that you must **haunt the tombs** and treat them with honor. But you have advanced to such a degree of wickedness that you think you do not need to listen even to the words of Jesus of Nazareth concerning this topic. Hear, then, what that man says about memorials: "Woe

³⁶ Henceforth, the verbs "worship" and "venerate" will be used to describe inappropriate and appropriate behavior towards relics, respectively.

³⁷ For an examination of the charges against the worship of martyrs, see Lucius, E. and G. Anrich. 1904. *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche*. Tübingen: Mohr, pp. 329ff.

³⁸ *Misop.* 361B (ed. Lacombrade, *L'empereur Julien*, 2.2.187).

³⁹ Cf. Porph. *Ad Marc.* 17: ἀσεβὴς οὐχ οὕτως ὁ τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν θεῶν μὴ **περιέπων** ὡς ὁ τὰς τῶν πολλῶν δόξας τῷ θεῷ προσάπτων. The one disregarding the images of the gods is less impious than the one holding the opinions of the multitude concerning God. (ed. Pötscher, *Porphyrios*, 6-38).

⁴⁰ For the way Jerome used this quotation, see the commentary on CV 8.2.

to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, who are like plastered tombs; the tomb appears beautiful on the outside, but inside it is full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness." If, then, Jesus said that tombs are full of uncleanness, how can you invoke God at them?⁴¹

Julian strategically interpreted the Christians' behavior as worship of the dead, although the latter believed they were celebrating the martyrs' victory over death.⁴² But the misrepresentation did not invalidate Julian's objections nor lessen their future traction. A few decades later, Eunapius of Sardis, a contemporary of Jerome and Vigilantius, wrote with similar disdain about the worship of relics:

ὅστέα γὰρ καὶ κεφαλὰς τῶν ἐπὶ πολλοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν ἐαλωκότων συναλίζοντες, οὓς τὸ πολιτικὸν ἐκόλαζε δικαστήριον, θεοὺς τε ἀπεδείκνυσαν, καὶ **προσεκαλινδοῦντο** τοῖς ὅστοις καὶ κρείττους ὑπελάμβανον εἶναι μολυνόμενοι πρὸς τοῖς τάφοις. μάρτυρες γοῦν ἐκαλοῦντο καὶ διάκονοί τινες καὶ πρέσβεις τῶν αἰτήσεων παρὰ τῶν θεῶν, ἀνδράποδα δεδουλευκότα κακῶς, καὶ μάστιξι καταδεδαπανημένα, καὶ τὰς τῆς μοχθηρίας ὠτειλὰς ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις φέροντα

For, by collecting the bones and skulls of those convicted for numerous crimes, men whom the city court had punished, they made them out to be gods, **haunted their bones**, and thought that they were better by polluting themselves at their graves. They were called martyrs, some sort of ministers, and ambassadors from the gods of people's prayers, these captives in evil servitude, destroyed by scourges and bearing on their phantom forms the scars of their wickedness⁴³

Both authors found several aspects of relic worship inappropriate, but, most of all, the miasma from the tombs and the excessive nature of the worship. Claudian, too, satirized the general Jacobus' erroneous faith in the power of relics;⁴⁴ Ammianus described Constantius' worship as an "*anilis superstitio*" as opposed to a "*simplex religio*" of true Christianity.⁴⁵

⁴¹ *Contra Galileos* 335Bff. (ed. Neumann, *Juliani*, 225).

⁴² Grabar, *Martyrium*, 2.39.

⁴³ *Vit. Soph.* 6.11.8-10 (ed. Giangrande, *Eunapii*, 472). The verb here and in the passage from Julian is rare and suggests that Eunapius was dependent on Julian.

⁴⁴ *Carm. min.* 50.

⁴⁵ 21.16.18.

b. Christians

Pagan authors were not alone in their criticism; worshiping and distributing relics was not ubiquitously accepted as standard practice among Christians, either. In Gaul, for instance, Exsuperius, the bishop of Toulouse, was reluctant to move Saturninus' bones into a basilica until he received official permission to do so.⁴⁶ Augustine also expressed initial concern that the veneration of martyrs might arouse suspicion of idolatry:

et tamen, carissimi, nos martyres nostros, quibus illi nulla ex parte sunt conferendi, pro diis non habemus, non tanquam deos colimus...habent honorabilem locum martyres sancti...non tamen pro Christo adorantur.

And, nevertheless, dearest brothers, we do not have in place of gods our martyrs in whom there must be no comparison, nor do we worship them as gods...The holy martyrs have an honorable place...they are not, however, worshiped in place of Christ.⁴⁷

That Augustine tried to define the difference between worshiping God and venerating martyrs suggests he felt a need to clarify this matter. However, in spite of these and earlier concerns, relics soon traveled great distances and found homes in churches throughout the empire, "so that, from their tombs, the blessed martyrs might now bestow holy gifts."⁴⁸

Problems with Trends in Christian Worship

a. Relics

In between a long list of insults and accusations, it is clear that one of Jerome assumed that Vigilantius' complaints against relics stemmed from his belief that corpses were polluting;

⁴⁶ Hunter, "Vigilantius," 409-10.

⁴⁷ Aug. *Serm.* 273.7 (PL 38, 1251).

⁴⁸ Paul. *Carm.* 19.309-10: "Ut iam de tumultis agerent pia dona beati / martyres" (CSEL 30, 129).

because of this assumption, Jerome thought this to be so un-Christian that he compared Vigilantius with the emperor Julian.⁴⁹

nos, qui eas suscipimus, appellare cinerarios et idolatras, qui mortuorum hominum ossa ueneremur. O infelicem hominem et omni lacrimarum fonte plangendum, qui haec dicens non se intellegit esse Samaritam et Iudaeum, qui corpora mortuorum pro inmundis habent et etiam uasa, quae in eadem domo fuerint, pollui suspicantur sequentes occidentem litteram et non spiritum uiuificantem... Et angeli, qui candidis uestibus utebantur, mortuo cadaueri atque polluto praebebant excubias; ut post multa saecula Dormitantius somniaret, immo eructaret immundissimam crapulam: et cum **Iuliano** persecutore, sanctorum basilicas aut destrueret, aut in templa conuerteret?

He is also calling us, because we receive the relics, ash-mongers and idolaters, since we honor dead men's bones. Oh unhappy man, to be wept for with every spring of tears. In saying these things, he does not understand that he is a Samaritan and a Jew, people who consider corpses unclean and even suspect that the vessels which were in the same house as them are polluted, following the letter that kills and not the living spirit... Thus, was also the body of the Lord unclean when it was placed in the sepulcher, and were the angels, who were wearing white garments, keeping watch over a dead and polluted corpse, so that after many centuries Dormitantius might dream, or rather release the filthiest belch from his hangover, and, with **Julian**, the persecutor of holy men, either destroy basilicas or convert them into temples?

It is not possible to isolate the precise nature of Vigilantius' concerns from the information in the *Contra Vigilantium*. What is evident from Vigilantius' writings is genuine worry over people's degree of worship, fearing that their excessive displays of devotion to relics (calling them 'cinerarios') might seem/be like paganism (*idolatrias*).

One of Vigilantius' first criticisms was that some Christians seemed to worship (*adorare*) and not honor (*honorare*) martyrs' relics. In CV 4.4, Jerome quotes Vigilantius:

...inter cetera uerba blasphemiae ista quoque dicentem: "Quid necesse est **tanto te honore non solum honorare, sed etiam adorare** illud nescio quid quod in modico uasculo transferendo colis?"

...and between other blasphemous words he even says: "Why is it necessary **not only that you honor with such great honor, but also that you worship** that something or other which you revere while carrying it around in a little vessel?"

⁴⁹ *Ep.* 109.1. For the word "cinerarios," see *TLL* s.v. 1061.73-1062.12. Its use here is unique, normally referring to those who curl hair, or as a neuter noun for a place to put ashes, "cinerarium."

The *distinctio* made between *honorare* and *adorare* shows that Vigilantius was aware of this central problem related to the cult of relics. In a Christian context, worshiping (with verbs like *adorare*, *colere*, and *venerari*) was reserved solely for God, not for anything or anyone else. Vigilantius was not the only one to focus on the difference. When Sulpicius Severus discussed the aftermath of the Priscillianist controversy, he wrote:

sectatores Priscilliani, qui eum prius ut sanctum **honoraauerant**, postea ut martyrem **colere** coeperunt.

Priscillian's followers, who had previously **honored** him as a holy man, subsequently began to **worship** him as a martyr.⁵⁰

In his defense of relic veneration, Augustine distinguished between honoring and worshiping martyrs:

...habent **honorabilem** locum martyres sancti...non tamen pro Christo **adorantur**.

The holy martyrs have an **honorable** place...they are not **worshiped** in place of Christ.⁵¹ Even though *adorare* seems similar to *honorare*, "*honorat enim omnis qui adorat, non autem adorat omnis qui honorat.*" So Augustine.⁵² Such a defense suggests that Augustine was responding to criticisms like those of Vigilantius. Thus, Vigilantius' distinction echoed concerns Christians had about who or what should be worshiped. That relics should be worshiped was unacceptable to some.

Vigilantius' rhetoric about the degree of worship was elaborated further by complaints about how Christians treated relics, namely carrying and kissing bits of dust wrapped in linen. *CV* 4.4 (*illud nescio quid quod in modico uasculo transferendo colis*) implies that Vigilantius

⁵⁰ Sulp. Sev. *Chron.* 2.51.7 (CSEL 1.105).

⁵¹ Aug. *Serm.* 273.7 (PL 38, 1251).

⁵² Aug. *Contra serm. Arian.* 23 (PL 42, 700).

must have seen more than a few people carrying around personal relics and worshiping them, and found their behavior inappropriate. It was certainly possible to have personal relics and authors attest the practice. For instance, at the end of the *Passio Perpetuae*, Saturus gave a soldier his ring dipped in his blood.⁵³ Years later, Paulinus, too, wrote of private relics as though they were common.⁵⁴

Vigilantius might also have been concerned about the authenticity of what passed for relics. Augustine, for instance, wrote that questionable relics were common.⁵⁵ Similarly, Optatus of Milevis, several decades earlier, wrote in his *Contra Parmenianum* of a noblewoman named Lucilla who, before receiving the Eucharist, kissed the bone of a martyr, “*si tamen martyris...si martyris sed necdum uindicati*.”⁵⁶ Although the passage was meant to attack Lucilla, the repeated focus on the true identity of the relic suggests that what was considered unacceptable about her behavior was that the person whose relic she kissed was unknown, not yet verified, or even the wrong sort of martyr.⁵⁷

However, the greater problem was one of degree. Nowhere in the citations of Vigilantius is there any polemic against the martyrs themselves. The problem was, as shown with his *distinctio*, that certain Christians seemed to venerate them in a way that bordered on worship. Such devotion seemed excessive even in the distant past: Cicero, in his Verrine orations, described a statue of Hercules found near the forum:

⁵³ *Pass. Perp.* 6.4.

⁵⁴ *Carm.* 18.

⁵⁵ Aug. *De op. mon.* 28.36: *alii membra martyrum, si tamen martyrum, uenditant* (PL 40, 575).

⁵⁶ Opt. *Mil. Con. Parm.* 1.16 (CSEL 26, 18).

⁵⁷ See Wiśniewski, R. 2011. “Lucilla and the Bone: Remarks on an Early Testimony to the Cult of Relics.” *JLA* 4: 157-61. The argument is that Optatus wrote this episode as a critique against contemporary ritual practices; the use of lexical evidence was not wholly convincing.

...rictum eius ac mentum paulo sit attritius, quod in precibus et gratulationibus **non solum id uenerari uerum etiam osculari** solent.

...his mouth and his chin are rather worn away, because the people, in their prayers and congratulations, are accustomed **not only to honor him, but even to kiss him.**⁵⁸

Later, Minucius Felix described Caecilius' superstitious behavior:

Caecilius, simulacro Serapidis denotato, ut vulgus **superstitiosus** solet, manum ori admovens **osculum labiis impressit.**

Caecilius, upon seeing the image of Serapis, as is the custom for the **superstitious** common people, placed his hand on his mouth and **kissed it.**⁵⁹

Centuries later, part of what was shocking about Lucilla's behavior was her exhibitionistic worship. The practice was not Lucilla's alone. People in the west had begun kissing relics and worshipping fervently.⁶⁰ Prudentius vividly described a scene of excessive worship in addition to describing the creation of personal contact relics from a martyr's fresh body:

ille ungularum duplices
sulcos **pererrat osculis,**
hic purpurantem corporis
gaudet cruorem lambere.
plerique uestem linteam
stillante tingunt sanguine,
tutamen ut sacrum suis
domi reseruent posteris.

One covers with kisses the double cuts made by the claws, another eagerly licks the red gore on the body. Many wet a linen garment with the drops of blood, **to lay it up at home** as a holy safeguard for their descendants.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.94.

⁵⁹ Min. Fel. *Oct.* 2 (CSEL 2, 4). The term "*superstitiosus*" was meant to be especially derogatory, the distinction between "*pagana superstitio*" and the "*religio*" of Christians increasing. Cf. *CTh* 16.10.2.

⁶⁰ Lucilla might have been the woman Augustine referred to as living in the only Donatist household in Spain, with African connections: "*Non est ergo in sola Africa, uel solis Afris, episcopum Romam paucis Montensibus, et in Hispaniam domui unius mulieris ex Africa mittentibus.*" *Ep. c. Pet.* 2.247 (CSEL 52, 159-60). If she had kissed relics in Spain as well, this well-known woman could have influenced the spread of the practice.

⁶¹ Prud. *Perist.* 5.337-44. (CCSL 126, 305-6).

Thus, kissing relics and keeping them for personal use were attested practices, but ones that up to the late 4th c., were still considered unusual. Vigilantius might have seen some of the fervor that Prudentius depicted and, if he had, would not have wanted the practices to continue, lest what appeared excessive and idolatrous distract Christians from proper devotion.

b. Candles

In addition to the degree of their worship, Vigilantius also disapproved of how some Christians lit numerous candles during the day:

Prope ritum gentilium uidemus sub praetextu religionis introductum in ecclesiis: sole adhuc fulgente moles cereorum accendi

We see that a practically pagan rite has been brought into the church under the pretext of piety, that although the sun is still shining, mounds of wax are being lit⁶²

Perhaps Vigilantius was anxious about wax being wasted. For instance, Vigilantius showed some concern for expense at other points in his text. He remarks on the cost of linen that was used to wrap “illud nescio quid.”⁶³ It is not merely costly, it is “pretiosus” (CV 4.6). Augustine discusses how wealthy men planned to be buried in “costly linens” to no purpose, “as if the master of the house should be sent into banishment, and you should garnish the walls of his house.”⁶⁴

Although Jerome depicted Vigilantius as one who enjoyed a life of luxury, he probably exaggerated. There is evidence in the rest of the *Contra Vigilantium* that shows a man more concerned with the benefits of spending on the local church than with indulging in fine foods and expensive garments. For instance, Jerome wrote that:

⁶² CV 4.6.

⁶³ Cf. Paul. *Ep.* 31.2 (CSEL 29, 269). He wrote to Severus in response to a request for a relic. Paulinus said that he would send the fragment of the cross that he had received as a gift from Melania and that it was wrapped in gold.

⁶⁴ Aug. *En. in Ps.* 48.2.7 (CCSL 38, 571): *spiritus torquetur apud inferos; quid illi prodest, quia corpus iacet in cinnamidis et aromatibus, inuolutum pretiosis linteis? tamquam si dominus domus mittatur in exsilium, et tu ornes parietes ipsius.*

tu prohibeas Hierosolymam in usus sanctorum aliqua sumptuum solatia dirigi. Videlicet si ad haec respondero, statim latrabis, meam me causam agere

I hear that you are preventing any financial relief from being sent to Jerusalem to assist the saints. Of course, if I respond to these things, you will immediately start yapping that I am pleading my own case

Respondebis, hoc unumquemque posse in patria sua facere: nec pauperes defuturos, qui Ecclesiae opibus sustentandi sint

You will respond that any person can do this in his own land and that there will be no lack of poor people to be supported by the resources of the Church.⁶⁵

Far from using his money to support his personal indulgences, Vigilantius was concerned with using all available resources to further the activities of his local church. While his views on asceticism were similar to others' in Gaul at the time, there is no evidence to suggest that his attitude towards spending was likewise lax.⁶⁶ Thus, it is possible that Vigilantius was also bothered by the cost of burning so many heaps of candles, especially when they were unnecessary in the daytime.

While cost might have played a part in his criticism, it is clear that Vigilantius was concerned that burning candles featured prominently in pagan rites. The hyperbole "moles cereorum" was probably a part of Vigilantius' polemic, for most Christians had accepted and approved of spending for the purposes of worship. It is certainly the case that Paulinus, for instance, described gilded basilicas.⁶⁷ The little that Jerome quoted also does not explicitly state Vigilantius' position on *luxus*.

⁶⁵ CV 13.2-3 and 14.1.

⁶⁶ Briccius, Martin's successor, was similarly against asceticism for the clergy. What is known about Briccius comes from Severus, however, an obviously hostile source; thus, information about the bishop must be taken with a grain of salt. See Hunter, "Vigilantius," 410-30 for more on the Gallic clergy's response to asceticism in the late fourth/early fifth century.

⁶⁷ E.g. the basilica built on top of the location of the Passion in Paul. *Ep.* 31.6 (*CSEL* 29, 273).

More specifically, candles were burned to honor the spirits of the dead thought to dwell in their tombs. For instance, Suetonius wrote that Augustus noticed that the tomb of Masgaba, one of his favorites, was visited by a large crowd with many torches (*magna turba multisque luminibus frequentari*);⁶⁸ inscriptions also announced the wishes of the dead, that someone might honor them with lights.⁶⁹ Knowing these practices, Christians did not immediately adopt the use of candles and lamps. For example, Tertullian wrote that Christians and philosophers were often considered similar, but only Christians were punished for their dissent and, in turn, forced to do things they did not wish:

Quis enim philosophum sacrificare aut deierare aut **lucernas meridie uanas** proferre compellit? Quin immo et deos uestros palam destruunt et superstitiones uestras commentariis quoque accusant laudantibus uobis.

For who compels a philosopher to sacrifice, or take an oath, or **bring out useless lamps in the middle of the day**? Rather, they destroy your gods openly and censure your superstitions in their treatises while you praise them.⁷⁰

Note Tertullian's use of "*uanas*," indicating a strong aversion to the use of these lamps. In addition, some felt that candles were too reminiscent of the cult of the dead. At the beginning of the fourth century, canon 34 from the Council of Elvira stated:

Cereos per diem, placuit in cimiterio non incendi, inquietandi enim spiritus sanctorum non sunt. Qui haec non obseruauerint arceantur ab ecclesiae communione.

The church decreed that candles not be lit at the cemetery during the day, for the spirits of the saints must not be disturbed. Whoever does not observe this rule should be kept from communion.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Suet. *Div. Aug.* 98.

⁶⁹ *CIL* 10.633, 2.2102, 6.10248, for example.

⁷⁰ Tert. *Apol.* 46.4 (CSEL 69).

⁷¹ Vives, *Concilios*, 7.

Emphasized in this canon is the antithesis of pagan belief: lighting candles disturbs the spirits of saints and does not bring them honor.

Over time, however, in spite of some consistent opposition,⁷² candles entered Christian practice and worship. Prudentius, in his *Cath.* 5, evoked many ways to bring light after nightfall;⁷³ Gregory of Nyssa and Jerome both wrote about candles and torches in funeral processions, for example. Even beyond the funeral, countless candles could be seen lighting the shrine of Felix in Nola:

Lumina ceratis **adolentur** odora papyris,
Nocte dieque micant, sic nox splendore diei
Fulget: et ipsa dies coelesti illustris honore,
Plus micat **innumeris** lucem geminata **lucernis**.

Fragrant lamps **are burned** with waxed bits of papyrus, and glow **night and day**; in this way, the night shines with the brilliance of day: even the day itself is bright with heavenly distinction, and shines more with its light doubled by the **countless lamps**.⁷⁴

For a man who did not believe candles to be an appropriate part of worship, these *innumerae lucernae* would certainly have appeared to Vigilantius to be unnecessary *moles cereorum*. Even the verb *adolere* would have been enough to fuel his anger, having been used often in contexts of pagan sacrifice and worship.⁷⁵ Thus, to Vigilantius, burning candles during the day to honor the holy dead was indeed *prope ritum gentilium*.

Conclusion

Vigilantius was fighting against great changes in Christian worship. He tried to resist them by writing against some of the most influential men of his day. Vigilantius' vision of a non-

⁷² For instance, Lactantius (*Inst.* 6.2) and Gregory of Nazianzen (*Or.* 5.35) felt that candles were unnecessary for veneration.

⁷³ *Cath.* 5.13-16; Greg. Nyss. *Vita S. Macr.*; and Jer. *Ep.* 108.29.

⁷⁴ Paul. *Carm.* 14.100-103 (CSEL 30, 49). See also CV 7.11.

⁷⁵ *TLL* s.v. 819.9ff.

privatized, communal form of Christianity could not compete with the direct connection to God that relics provided. Instead of Vigilantius' belief that the souls of martyrs remain in a fixed and unreachable place, others chose to believe that martyrs' essential being resided in their relics, offering each believer a tangible and moveable piece of God's power; it was the very portability of relics that secured their place in Catholic worship.⁷⁶ Although he was unable to reverse the negative changes he saw, Vigilantius' efforts rippled through Gaul and Bethlehem. From 396 onward, his views on resurrection and relics began to depart from and affect his more well-known acquaintances. That Vigilantius forced them to defend their positions, that an innkeeper from Calagurris could inspire men like Jerome to lift their pens, was a sign of success.

⁷⁶ For more on how the portability of relics affected their role in medieval Christianity, see Smith, J.M.H. 2012. "Portable Christianity: Relics in the Medieval West (c. 700-c. 1200)." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 181: 143-167.

Text and Translation

Chapter I

1 Multa in orbe monstra generata sunt: centauros et sirenas, ululas et onocrotalos in Esaia legimus. Iob Leviathan et Behemoth mystico sermone describit. **2** Cerberum et stymphalidas aprumque erymanthium et leonem nemeaeum, chimaeram atque hydram multorum capitum narrant fabulae poetarum. **3** Cacum describit Vergilius. **4** Triformem geryonem Hispaniae prodiderunt. **5** Sola Gallia monstra non habuit, sed uiris semper fortibus et eloquentissimis abundauit. **6** Exortus est subito Vigilantius <immo> Dormitantius, qui immundo spiritu pugnet contra Christi Spiritum et martyrum neget sepulcra ueneranda, damnandas dicat esse uigilias et numquam nisi in Pascha alleluia cantandum, continentiam haeresim, pudicitiam libidinis seminarium. **7** Et quomodo Euphorbus in Pythagoram renatus esse perhibetur, sic in isto Ioviniani mens praua surrexit, ut et in illo et in hoc diaboli respondere cogamur insidiis. **8** Cui iure dicitur: “*Semen pessimum, para filios tuos occisioni peccatis patris sui.*” **9** Ille Romanae ecclesiae auctoritate damnatus inter phasides aues et carnes suillas non tam emisit spiritum quam eructauit. **10** Iste caupo Calagurritanus et in peruersum propter nomen uiculi mutus Quintilianus miscet aquam uino, et de artificio pristino suae uenena perfidiae catholicae fidei sociare conatur, impugnare uirginitatem, odisse pudicitiam, in conuiuio saecularium contra sanctorum ieiunia declamare.

Many monsters have populated the world: we read of centaurs, sirens, owls and pelicans in Isaiah. Job describes the Leviathan and Behemoth in his mystic language. Cerberus, the Stymphalian birds, the Erymanthian boar, the Nemean lion, the Chimera and the many-headed Hydra – all of these are mentioned in the fables of poets. Virgil also describes the monster Cacus. Spain has produced the triple-bodied Geryon. Gaul alone did not have monsters, overflowing instead with invariably brave and very eloquent men. But suddenly there arose Vigilantius, nay, Dormitantius, to fight against the spirit of Christ with his own unclean spirit and criticize the veneration of martyrs’ tombs, to claim that vigils are condemnable, that no one should ever sing “Hallelujah” unless it is Easter, that continence is heresy, chastity the breeding ground for desire. As Euphorbus is said to have been reborn in Pythagoras, so in Vigilantius the depraved mind of Jovinian was resurrected so that in the former and the latter we are to grapple with the snares of the devil to whom it will be rightly said: “*Most wicked seed, prepare your children for slaughter for the sins of your father.*” Jovinian, condemned by the authority of the Roman church, amid Colchian birds and the flesh of swine, did not so much breathe as belch out his last breath. Vigilantius, that innkeeper of Calagurris, that mute Quintilian (on account of the name of his village), mixes water with wine; with this ancient practice, he is attempting to mix the poisons of his treachery with the Catholic faith, to attack virginity, to spread hatred of chastity and, at a feast of secular people, to declaim against the fasting of saints.

11 Dum inter phialas philosophatur et ad placentas ligurriens psalmodum modulatione mulcetur, ut tantum inter epulas Daud et Idithun et Asaph et filiorum Chore cantica audire dignetur.

12 Haec dolentis magis effudi animo quam ridentis, dum me cohibere non possum et iniuriam apostolorum ac martyrum surda nequeo aure transire.

Chapter II

1 Pro nefas episcopos sui dicitur sceleris habere consortes, si tamen episcopi nominandi sunt qui non ordinant diaconos, nisi prius uxores duxerint, nulli caelibum credentes pudicitiam, immo ostendentes quam sancte uiuant, qui male de omnibus suspicantur, et nisi praegnantibus uxores uiderint clericorum infantesque in ulnis matrum uagantes, Christi sacramenta non tribuunt. **2** Quid facient orientis ecclesiae? **3** Quid Aegypti et sedis apostolicae, quae aut uirgines clericos accipit aut continentes, aut, si uxores habuerint, mariti esse desistunt? **4** Hoc docuit Dormitantius, libidini frena permittens et naturalem carnis ardorem, qui in adulescentia plerumque feruescit, suis hortatibus duplicans, immo extinguens coitu feminarum, ut <non sit> quo distemus a porcis, quo differamus a brutis animantibus, quo ab equis, de quibus scriptum est: *“Equi insanientes in feminas facti sunt mihi: unusquisque in uxorem proximi sui hinniebat.”* **5** Hoc est quod loquitur per Daud Spiritus Sanctus: *“Nolite fieri sicut equus et mulus, quibus non est intellectus.”* **6** Et rursum de Dormitantio ac sociis eius: *“In freno et camo maxillas eorum constringe qui non approximant ad te.”*

While he philosophizes amongst his cups and licks his chops at the prospect of cakes, he is soothed by Psalm-singing, with the result that he only deigns to listen to songs about David and Jeduthun, Asaph and the sons of Core during banquets. I have poured these things out more from grief than amusement; I cannot contain myself and I cannot turn a deaf ear to any abuse against apostles and martyrs.

Shocking! He is said to have bishops as his allies in wickedness. Bishops, if they should even be called bishops, who do not ordain deacons before they have married; they do not believe that any celibate person is actually chaste. Instead, they prefer to demonstrate in what a holy way they live by suspecting everyone else of evil-doing; and unless they see clergymen with pregnant wives as well as with infants howling in their mothers' arms, will not grant them the sacraments of Christ. What will the Churches of the East do? What about the churches of Egypt or the Apostolic See which only accept men who are either virgins or continent, or, if they have had wives, are no longer married? This was Dormitantius' doctrine. He let the bridles on his lust slacken and through his encouragement doubled the natural burning of the flesh that frequently begins to flame during adolescence; or, rather, he puts it out by having sex with women so that we are in no way different from pigs, no way dissimilar to wild beasts, or to horses about which it is written: *“They became, in my opinion, like crazed horses chasing after women: each one was neighing for the wife of his neighbor.”* This is what the Holy Spirit said through David: *“Do not become like a horse or a mule, who have no intellect.”* And again, concerning Dormitantius and his cohorts: *“With a bit and a bridle restrain the mouths of those who do not come to you.”*

Chapter III

1 Sed iam tempus est ut ipsius uerba ponentes ad singula respondere nitamur. **2** Fieri enim potest ut rursus malignus interpres dicat fictam a me materiam, cui rhetorica declamatione respondeam, sicut illam quam scripsi ad Gallias, matris et filiae inter se discordantium. **3** Auctores sunt huius dictatiunculae meae presbyteri Riparius et Desiderius, qui parrochias suas uicinia istius dicunt esse maculatas, miseruntque libros per fratrem Sisinnium, quos inter crapulam stertens euomuit. **4** Et adserunt repertos esse nonnullos, qui fauentes uitis suis, illius blasphemiis adquiescunt. **5** Est quidem imperitus et uerbis et scientia, et sermone inconditus: nec uera quidem potest defendere, sed propter homines saeculi et mulierculas oneratas peccatis, semper discentes et numquam ad scientiam ueritatis peruenientes, una lucubrationcula illius neniis respondebo, ne sanctorum uirorum qui ut hoc facerem deprecati sunt, uidear litteras respuisse.

Chapter IV

1 Nimirum respondeat generi suo, ut qui de latronum et conuenarum natus est semine, quos Cn Pompeius edomita Hispania et ad triumphum uenire festinans de Pyrenaei iugis deposuit et in unum oppidum congregauit, unde et Conuenarum urbs nomen accepit, hucusque latrocinetur contra ecclesiam dei, et de Vasconibus, Aruacis Celtiberisque descendens, incurset Galliarum ecclesias portetque nequaquam uexillum crucis, sed insigne diaboli.

But now it is time for me to lay out his words and respond point by point; for it is possible that a certain spiteful interpreter may say that I am fabricating this material so as to respond to it with a rhetorical exercise, just like the “letter” that I wrote to Gaul about the mother and daughter quarreling with one another. The holy presbyters, Riparius and Desiderius, who write that their parishes are tainted by mere proximity to the man, are the driving force behind this little piece of mine. Through brother Sisinnius they have even sent the works that [Vigilantius] managed to vomit up while snoring between hangovers, and they assert that there are not a few men who, in support of that man’s sins, acquiesce in his blasphemies. He lacks skill in letters and knowledge; in speech he lacks culture. He cannot even defend what is true! Still, because of these secular men, these poor little women weighed down by their sins, all of them learning and never approaching actual knowledge of the truth - because of them, I will respond to that man’s rubbish in a single night’s vigil. I would not want to appear have rejected the letters of the holy men who asked me to do this.

No surprise that he reflects his upbringing, being born from the stock of bandits and tramps (Pompey, after subduing Spain and being in a hurry to return for the triumph, brought them down from the Pyrenees and grouped them together in one town; this is how the city of Convenae got its name). After all, he still engages in banditry against the church of God, and, being a descendant of the Vectones, the Arrabaci, and the Celtiberians, he makes raids upon the churches of Gaul, not carrying the standard of the cross, but the banner of the devil.

2 Fecit hoc idem Pompeius etiam in orientis partibus, ut Cilicibus et Isauris piratis latronibusque superatis sui nominis inter Ciliciam et Isauriam conderet ciuitatem. 3 Sed haec urbs hodie seruat scita maiorum et nullus in ea ortus est Dormitantius. 4 Galliae uernaculum hostem sustinent et hominem moti capitis atque Hippocratis uinculis adligandum sedentem cernunt in ecclesia, et inter cetera uerba blasphemiae ista quoque dicentem: QUID NECESSE EST TANTO TE HONORE NON SOLUM HONORARE, SED ETIAM ADORARE ILLUD NESCIQ QUOD IN MODICO VASCULO TRANSFERENDO COLIS? 5 Et rursum in eodem libro: QUID PULVEREM LINTEAMINE CIRCUMDATUM ADORANDO OSCULARIS? 6 Et in consequentibus: PROPE RITUM GENTILIUM VIDEMUS SUB PRAETEXTU RELIGIONIS INTRODUCITUM IN ECCLESIIS: SOLE ADHUC FULGENTE MOLES CEREORUM ACCENDI, UT UBICUMQUE PULVISCVLUM NESCIQ QUOD IN MODICO VASCULO PRETIOSO LINTEAMINE CIRCUMDATUM OSCULANTES ADORENT. 7 MAGNUM HONOREM PRAEBENT HUIUSMODI HOMINES BEATISSIMIS MARTYRIBUS, QUOS PUTANT DE VILISSIMIS CEREOLIS ILLUSTRANDOS, QUOS AGNUS, QUI EST IN MEDIO THRONI CUM OMNI FULGORE MAIESTATIS SUAE ILLUSTRAT.

Chapter V

1 Quis enim, o insanum caput, aliquando martyres adorauit? 2 Quis hominem putauit deum?

Pompey himself did the very same thing in the East: after he overcame the Cilician and Isaurian pirates and brigands, he founded a city in his name right between Cicilia and Isauria. But that city to this day preserves the ordinances of its ancestors and no Dormitantius has been born there. Gaul puts up with a homegrown enemy and sees sitting in its church a man whose head jiggles, deserving to be bound with Hippocratean chains, and between other blasphemous words he even says: “Why is it necessary not only that you honor with such great honor, but also that you worship that something or other which you revere while carrying it around in a little vessel?” And again in the same work: “Why do you kiss and worship dust wrapped in linen?” In the following: “We see that a practically pagan rite has been brought into the church under the pretext of piety, that although the sun is still shining, mounds of wax are being lit, so that people everywhere may worship and kiss some small quantity of dust or suchlike in a little vessel, nestled in expensive linen cloth. Men of this kind confer a great honor upon the most blessed martyrs, thinking that they should be given splendor from the cheapest of candles, men to whom the Lamb, who is in the middle throne with all the brilliance of his majesty, gives splendor.”

Who, you insane man, has ever worshipped martyrs? Who considered a human being to be God?

3 Nonne Paulus et Barnabas cum a Lycaonibus Iuppiter et Mercurius putarentur et eis uellent hostias immolare sciderunt uestimenta sua et se homines esse dixerunt, non quod meliores non essent olim mortuis hominibus Ioue atque Mercurio, sed quod sub gentilitatis errore honor eis deo debitus deferretur? **4** Quod et de Petro legimus, qui Cornelium se adorare cupientem manu subleuauit et dixit: “*Surge nam et ego homo sum.*” **5** Et audes dicere: ILLUD NESICIO QUID QUOD IN MODICO VASCULO TRANSFERENDO COLIS. **6** Quid est ILLUD NESICIO QUID, scire desidero! **7** Expone manifestius, ut tota libertate blasphemēs, PULVISCULUM, inquis, IN MODICO VASCULO PRETIOSO LINTEAMINE CIRCUMDATUM. **8** Dolet martyrum reliquias pretioso operiri uelamine et non uel pannis et cilicio colligari uel proci in sterquilinum ut solus Vigilantius ebrius et dormiens adoretur. **9** Ergo sacrilegi sumus, quando apostolorum basilicas ingredimur? **10** Sacrilegus fuit Constantius imperator, qui sanctas reliquias Andreae, Lucae et Timothei transtulit Constantinopolim, apud quas daemones rugiunt et habitatores Vigilantii illorum se sentire praesentiam confitentur? **11** Sacrilegus dicendus est et nunc Augustus Arcadius, qui ossa beati Samuhelis longo post tempore de Iudaea transtulit Thraciam? **12** Omnes episcopi non solum sacrilegi, sed et fatui iudicandi, qui rem uilissimam et cineres dissolutos in serico et uase aurea portauerunt? **14** Videlicet adorabant Samuhelem et non Christum, cuius Samuhel et leuita et propheta fuit.

Was it not the case that Paul and Barnabas, when the people of Lycaonia thought they were Jupiter and Mercury and wanted to prepare sacrifices for them, tore their garments and declared that they were human beings? Not because they were not better than Jupiter and Mercury, who were once dead men, but because, according to the mistaken beliefs of the gentiles, honor was being given to them when it was owed to God. And we also read that Peter, when Cornelius wanted to worship him, raised him and said, “*Stand up, for I, too, am a man.*” And are you so brazen as to say, “that something or other that you worship by carrying it around in a little vessel”? I really want to know! What is this “something or other”? Explain more clearly, so that you can blaspheme with complete freedom, what you mean by “some speck of dust or other in a little vessel, nestled in expensive linen cloth.” He is upset that martyrs’ remains are covered in costly linen instead of being tied up with rags or hair shirts or cast onto a heap of manure; thus, only Vigilantius, drunk and drowsy, may be worshiped. Does it follow, then, that we are sacrilegious when we enter the basilicas of the Apostles? Was Constantius the Emperor sacrilegious when he transferred the remains of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy to Constantinople? No, the demons roared and the inhabitants of Vigilantius confessed that they sensed their presence. Then, must Emperor Arcadius also now be called sacrilegious, since he, after a long time, transferred the bones of the blessed Samuel from Judaea to Thrace? Are all bishops, then, not only sacrilegious but also to be judged as silly because they have carried the cheapest substance, crumbled ashes, around in silk and inside a golden vase?

13 Stulti omnium ecclesiarum populi, qui occurrerunt sanctis reliquiis et tanta laetitia quasi praesentem uiuentemque cernerent susceperunt, ut de Palaestina usque Calcedonem iungerentur populorum examina et in Christi laudes una uoce sonarent? **14** Videlicet adorabant Samuhelem et non Christum, cuius Samuhel et leuita et propheta fuit. **15** Mortuum suspicaris et idcirco blasphemias. Lege Euangelium: “*Deus Abraham, deus Isaac, deus Iacob. Non est deus mortuorum, sed uiuorum.*” Si ergo uiuunt, honesto, iuxta te, carcere non claudantur.

Chapter VI

1 Ais enim uel in sinu Abrahae uel in loco refrigerii uel subter aram dei animas apostolorum et martyrum consedis nec posse suis tumultis et ubi uoluerint adesse praesentes. **2** Senatoriae uidelicet dignitatis sunt, ut non inter homicidas teterrimo carcere, sed in libera honestaque custodia in fortunatorum insulis et in campis elysiis recludantur. **3** Tu deo leges pones, tu apostolis uincula inicies, ut usque ad diem iudicii teneantur custodia nec sint cum domino suo, de quibus scriptum est: “*Sequuntur agnum quocumque uadit?*” **4** Si agnus ubique ergo et hi qui cum agno sunt ubique esse credendi sunt; et cum diabolus et daemones toto uagentur orbe et celeritate nimia ubique praesentes sint, martyres post effusionem sanguinis sui ara operientur inclusi et inde exire non poterunt? **5** Dicis in libello tuo quod dum uiuimus mutuo pro nobis orare possumus. **6** Postquam autem mortui fuerimus, nullius sit pro alio exaudienda oratio,

Are the people of all churches foolish, who went to visit holy relics and received them with as great a joy as if they were seeing a living being in the flesh so that crowds of people might be joined together from Palestine all the way to Chalcedon and resound in one voice in praise of Christ? It *must* have been the case that these people adored Samuel instead of Christ - Samuel who was Christ's Levite and prophet. You are suspicious of the dead, so you blaspheme. Read the Gospel: “*God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob. He is not God of the dead, but of the living.*” If they are alive, then, according to you, they should not be kept in an honorable confinement.

You say that the souls of the apostles and the martyrs have come to rest either in the lap of Abraham, or in a place of refreshment, or under the altar of god and that they are unable to leave their tombs and be present where they wish. Evidently they are of senatorial rank and are not locked up in the foulest prison among murderers, but are kept under free and honorable custody on the Isles of the Blessed and the Elysian Fields. Will you set down the laws for God? Will you throw the apostles into chains so that they may be kept in custody until the Day of Judgment and that they may not be with their Lord? Of them it is written: “*They follow the lamb wherever he goes.*” If the lamb is everywhere, then those who are with the lamb must be believed to be everywhere. And while the devil and his demons wander throughout the world and appear in every place with excessive speed, will the martyrs, locked up, be trapped in an altar after pouring forth their blood and be unable to leave? You say in your little pamphlet that while we live, we are able to pray for one another reciprocally; after we have died, however, one's prayer on behalf of another cannot be heard.

praesertim cum martyres ultionem sui sanguinis obsecrantes impetrare non quierint. **7** Si apostoli et martyres adhuc in corpore constituti possunt orare pro ceteris quando de se adhuc debent esse solliciti, quanto magis post coronas, uictorias et triumphos? **8** Unus homo Moyses sexcentis milibus armatorum impetrat a deo ueniam, et Stephanus imitator Domini sui et primus martyr in Christo persecutoribus ueniam deprecatur, et postquam cum Christo esse coeperint, minus ualebunt? **9** Paulus Apostolus ducentas septuaginta sex sibi dicit in naui animas condonatas et postquam resolutus coeperit esse cum Christo, tunc ora clausurus est et pro his qui in toto orbe ad suum Euangelium crediderunt muttire non poterit, meliorque erit Vigilantius canis uiuens quam ille leo mortuus? **10** Recte hoc de Ecclesiaste proponeres, si Paulum in spiritu mortuum confiterer. **11** Denique sancti non appellantur mortui, sed dormientes. **12** Unde et Lazarus, qui resurrecturus erat, dormisse perhibetur. **13** Et Apostolus uetat Thessalinicenses de dormientibus contristari. **14** Tu uigilans dormis et dormiens scribis, et proponis mihi librum apocryphum, qui sub nomine Ezrae a te et similibus tuis legitur, ubi scriptum est quod post mortem nullus pro aliis audeat deprecari. **15** Quem ego librum numquam legi. **16** Quid enim necesse est manus sumere quod ecclesia non recipit? **17** Nisi forte Balsamum mihi et Barbelo, et thesaurum Manichaei et ridiculum nomen Leosiborae <proferas>,

This is especially true since the martyrs, even though they pray for someone to avenge their blood, are unable, according to you, to get what they desire. If apostles and martyrs, still in corporeal form, are able to pray for others when they ought to be concerned with their own welfare, how much more should they do so after their crowns, their victories and their triumphs? One man, Moses, gains pardon from God for six hundred thousand armed men; Stephen, an imitator of his Lord and the first martyr in Christ, prays for the pardon of his persecutors. Will they have less power after they have begun their life with Christ? Paul the Apostle says that two hundred and seventy-six souls were given to him on his ship, and, after he has begun to be with Christ unreservedly, then will he close his mouth and be unable to utter a word on behalf of those throughout the world who believed in his gospel? Then will Vigilantius, the living dog, be better than that dead lion? You would be using this passage of Ecclesiastes correctly, if I were to confess that Paul was dead in spirit. In fact, saints are not called dead, but sleeping. For this reason Lazarus, who had been resurrected, is considered to have been asleep. And the apostle forbids the Thessalonians to grieve over those who are merely sleeping. You sleep when you are awake, and write in your sleep; and you recommend to me this apocryphal book that is read by you and those like you under the name of Esdras. In this book, it was written that after death, no one would dare to pray for others. Of course, I have never read this book - why should I take up in my hands what the church does not recognize? Unless perhaps you should offer me Balsamus, and Barbelo, and the Treasure of Mani, and the ridiculous name of Leusiboras,

et quia ad radices Pyrenaei habitas uicinusque es Hiberiae, Basilidis antiquissimi haeretici et imperitae scientiae incredibilia portenta perquiris et proponis quod totius orbis auctoritate damnatur: nam in commentariolo tuo quasi pro te faciens de Salomone sumis testimonium quod Salomon omnino non scripsit, ut qui habes alterum Ezram habeas et Salomonem alterum. **18** Et si tibi placuerit, legito fictas reuelationes omnium patriarcharum et prophetarum, et cum illas didiceris, inter mulierum textrina cantato, immo legendas propone in tabernis tuis, ut facilius per has nenias uulgus indoctum prouoces ad bibendum.

Chapter VII

1 Cereos autem non clara luce accendimus, sicut frustra calumniaris, sed ut noctis tenebras hoc solacio temperemus et uigilemus ad lumen, ne tecum dormiamus in tenebris. **2** Quod si aliqui per imperitiam et simplicitatem saecularium hominum uel certe religiosarum feminarum, de quibus uere possumus dicere: “*Confiteor: zelum dei habent, sed non secundum scientiam,*” hoc pro honore martyrum faciunt, quid inde perdis? **3** Causabantur quondam et apostoli quod periret unguentum, sed Domini uoce correpti sunt. **4** Neque enim ipse Christus indigebat unguento nec martyres lumine cereorum, et tamen illa mulier in honore Christi hoc fecit deuotioque mentis eius recipitur. **5** Et quicumque accendunt cereos, secundum fidem suam habent mercedem, dicente Apostolo: “*Unusquisque in suo sensu abundet.*” **6** Idolatras appellas huiusmodi homines? **7** Non diffiteor omnes nos qui Christo credimus de idolatriae errore uenisse.

then, because you live at the foot of the Pyrenees, and you are close to Iberia, you seek the unbelievable portents of Basilides, the most ancient heretic and a man of “knowledge” and you propose what is condemned by the authority of the world. For in your little book, you quote from Solomon as if he were in your corner, but he did not even write it, all so that you, because you have another Esdras, may have another Solomon. Also, if it is to your liking, read the made-up revelations of all the patriarchs and prophets; and once you have learned them, sing them in the company of weaving women. Better still, suggest that they be read in your taverns! Through these ditties, you can more easily encourage your ignorant lackeys to top off their drinks.

Moreover, we do not light candles in broad daylight, as you falsely charge to no purpose, but we do so in order to temper the shadows of nightfall by means of this comfort. We also watch for the dawn, so that we may not sleep in darkness with you. And, if some secular men, through ignorance and simplicity, or some religious women, about whom we can truly say: “*I confess, they have zeal for God, but not according to knowledge,*” do this in honor of martyrs, what do you lose from this practice? At one time, even the apostles were alleging that the oil was going to waste; but they were chastised by the voice of God. For Christ was not in need of oil, nor the martyrs in need of the light of candles. Nevertheless, that woman did this in honor of Christ, and the devotion of her mind was welcomed. Whoever lights candles has a reward according to his faith. The apostle says, “*Let each person abound in his own meaning.*” Do you call men of this sort idolaters? I do not deny that all of us who believe in Christ have come to our faith from the error of idolatry;

8 Non enim nascimur, sed renascimur christiani. **9** Et quia quondam colebamus idola, nunc deum colere non debemus, ne simili eum uideamur cum idolis honore uenerari? **10** Illud fiebat idolis et idcirco detestandum est, hoc fit martyribus et ideo recipiendum est. **11** Nam et absque martyrum reliquiis per totas orientis ecclesias quando legendum est Euangelium accenduntur luminaria iam sole rutilante non utique ad fugandas tenebras, sed ad signum laetitiae demonstrandum. **12** Unde et uirgines illae euangelicae semper habent accensas lampadas, et ad apostolos dicitur: “*Sint lumini uestri accincti et lucernae in manibus uestris;*” et de Iohanne baptista: “*Ille erat lucerna lucens,*” ut sub typo luminis corporalis illa lux ostendatur, de qua in Psalmo legimus: “*Lucerna pedibus meis uerbum tuum, Domine, et lumen semitis meis.*”

Chapter VIII

1 Male facit ergo Romanus episcopus, qui super mortuorum hominum Petri et Pauli, secundum nos ossa ueneranda, secundum te uile puluisculum, offert domino sacrificia, et tumulos eorum Christi arbitratur altaria? **2** Et non solum unius urbis, sed totius orbis errant episcopi, qui cauponem Vigilantium contemnentes, ingrediuntur basilicas mortuorum, in quibus puluis uilissimus et fauilla nescio quae iacet linteamine colligata, ut polluta omnia polluat et quasi sepulcra pharisaica foris dealbata sint, cum intus immundo cinere sordeant. **3** Et post haec de barathro pectoris sui caenosam spurcitiam euomens audet dicere:

for we are not born, but are reborn as Christians. Because we used to worship idols, we should not worship God now, because we may seem to worship God with a similar honor once given to idols? That was done for idols and should therefore be detested; this is done for martyrs and should thus be accepted. For, even apart from the relics of the martyrs, candles are lit in every church of the East when the Gospel ought to be read while the sun is already reddening at dawn, certainly not for the purpose of chasing shadows away, but for showing a sign of joy. For this reason, the virgins of the Gospel always have their lamps lit, and it is said to the apostles: “*Let your loins be girded and your lamps in your hands.*” Of John the Baptist: “*He was a shining lamp,*” so that, under this type of bodily radiance, the light may be revealed which we read of in the Psalms: “*Your word is a lamp for my feet and a light for my paths.*”

Therefore, is the bishop of Rome doing something wrong when, over the bones of the mortal men, Peter and Paul, bones considered worthy of veneration by us and cheap dust by you, he offers sacrifices to the Lord and considers their tombs altars of Christ? Of course the bishops not only of one city, but of the whole world are clearly wrong when they, slighting Innkeeper Vigilantius, enter the basilicas of the dead, in which lie “worthless dust, and some sort of ash, wrapped in linen,” so that, being polluted, it may pollute all else and, like the sepulchers of the Pharisees, may be whitened on the outside while they are soiled with unclean ash within. And after these words, vomiting up the grimy filth from the pit of his body, he dares to say:

ERGO CINERES SUOS AMANT ANIMAE MARTYRUM
ET CIRCUMVOLANT EOS SEMPERQUE PRAESENTES
SUNT, NE FORTE, SI ALIQUIS PRECATOR ADVENERIT,
ABSENTES AUDIRE NON POSSINT? **4** O portentum in
terras ultimas deportandum! **5** Rides de reliquiis martyrum, et
cum auctore huius haereseos Eunomio ecclesiis Christi
calumniam struis, nec tali societate terroris, ut eadem contra
nos loquaris quae ille contra ecclesiam loquitur? **6** Omnes enim
sectatores eius basilicas apostolorum et martyrum non
ingrediuntur, ut scilicet mortuum adorent Eunomium, cuius
libros maioris auctoritatis arbitrantur quam Euangelia. **7** Et in
ipso esse credunt columen veritatis, sicut aliae haereses
paracletum in Montanum uenisse contendunt et Manichaeum
ipsum dicunt esse paracletum. **8** Scribit aduersum haeresim
tuam, quae olim erupit contra ecclesiam, ne et in hoc quasi
repertor noui sceleris glorieris, Tertullianus uir eruditissimus
uolumen insigne, quod Scorpiace uocat rectissimo nomine,
quia arcuato uulnere in ecclesiae corpus uenena diffundit; quae
olim appellabatur Caina haeresis, et multo tempore dormiens
uel sepulta, nunc a Dormitatio suscitata est. **9** Miror quod non
dicas nequaquam perpetranda martyria, Deum enim, qui
sanguinem hircorum taurorumque non quaerat, multo magis
hominum non requirere. **10** Quod cum dixeris, immo etsi non
dixeris, ita habebis quasi dixeris. **11** Qui enim reliquias
martyrum asseris esse calcandas, prohibe sanguinem fundi, qui
nullo honore condignus est.

“Do the souls of the martyrs love their own ashes and flit
around them, always being present, so that, should someone by
chance approach to pray, they may be close enough to hear
every word?” O portent, that deserves to be deported to the
farthest reaches of the earth! Do you laugh at the relics of the
martyrs, and, along with Eunomius, the author of this heresy,
do you construct false accusations to damage the churches of
Christ? Are you not terrified to keep such company, to speak
the same things against us that he speaks against the church? In
fact, all of his followers decline to enter the basilicas of the
apostles and martyrs, evidently so that they may worship the
dead Eunomius, whose books they consider of greater authority
than the Gospel. They even believe that the pillar of truth is in
that very man, just as other heresies claim that the Paraclete
entered Montanus, and they say that Mani himself was the
Paraclete. Against your heresy, which broke out against the
church long ago (do not glory in this matter as if you were the
inventor of a new crime), Tertullian, a most learned man, wrote
a famous work which he calls most fittingly *Scorpiace*, because
the heresy, which was once called the heresy of Cain, injects
poison into the body of the church with a bow-shaped wound,
and it has slept, or been buried, for a long time, but has now
been awakened by Dormitatio. I marvel at how you do not
say that martyrdoms should in no way be carried out, for God,
who does not seek the blood of goats or bulls, seeks far less the
blood of man. When you say this, rather, even if you do not say
it, you will still be regarded as though you did. For you,
asserting that martyrs’ relics must be trampled over, prevent
blood that is worthy of no honor from being shed.

Chapter IX

1 De uigiliis et pernoctationibus in basilicis martyrum saepe celebrandis, in altera epistula, quam ante hoc ferme biennium sancto Ripario presbytero scripseram, respondi breuiter. **2** Quod si ideo eas aestimas respuendas, ne saepe uideamur Pascha celebrare et non sollemnes post annum exercere uigilias, ergo et die dominico non sunt Christo offerenda sacrificia, ne resurrectionis domini crebro Pascha celebremus et incipiamus non unum Pascha habere, sed plurima. **3** Error autem et culpa iuuenum uilissimarumque mulierum, qui per noctem saepe deprehenditur, non est religiosis hominibus imputandus, quia et in uigiliis Paschae tale aliquid fieri plerumque conuincitur, et tamen paucorum culpa non praeiudicat religioni, qui et absque uigiliis possunt errare uel in suis, uel in alienis domibus. **4** Apostolorum fidem Iudae proditio non destruxit. **5** Et nostras ergo uigilias malae aliorum uigiliae non destruent. **6** Quin potius pudicitiae uigilare cogantur, qui libidini dormiunt. **7** Quod enim semel fecisse bonum est, non potest malum esse, si frequentius fiat, aut, si aliqua culpa uitanda est, non ex eo quod saepe, sed ex eo quod fit aliquando culpabile est. **8** Non uigilemus itaque diebus Paschae, ne expectata diu adulterorum desideria compleantur, ne occasionem peccandi uxor inueniat, ne maritali non possit recludi clauae. **9** Ardentius appetitur quidquid est rarius.

Chapter X

1 Non possum uniuersa percurrere, quae sanctorum presbyterorum litterae comprehendunt. **2** De libellis ipsius aliqua proferam.

Concerning the vigils and night watches that ought to be practiced frequently in the basilicas of the martyrs, I responded briefly in another letter written to the holy presbyter Riparius nearly two years ago. But you judge that they should be rejected, lest we seem to celebrate Easter too often and seem not to exercise the proper vigils every year. Therefore, on the Lord's Day, sacrifices must not be offered to Christ lest we celebrate the Easter of our Lord's resurrection too frequently and we begin to have not one Easter, but many. However, religious men should not be charged with the error and the guilt of young men and the most worthless women, faults that are often detected at night. While such a thing generally is shown to occur during Easter vigils, nevertheless, the guilt of a few, who are able to err even without vigils, in their homes as well in the homes of others, should not be injurious to devotion. Judas' betrayal did not destroy the faith of the apostles. So, the improper vigils of others will not destroy ours. Rather, let those who sleep to satisfy their lust be compelled to stay awake for chastity. In fact, what is good to have done once, cannot be evil if it is done more frequently; or, if any sin is to be avoided, it is culpable not because it happens often, but because it happens at all. Thus, let us not keep watch on the days of Easter lest the long-awaited desires of adulterers be satisfied, lest the wife find an opportunity for sin, lest she be unable to be locked in with her husband's key. What occurs more rarely is more ardently sought.

I am unable to run through all of the topics that the letters of the holy presbyters cover, so I will mention some from his treatises.

3 Argumentatur contra signa atque uirtutes quae in basilicis martyrum fiunt et dicit eas incredulis prodesse, non credentibus, quasi nunc hoc quaeratur, quibus fiant, et non qua uirtute fiant. **4** Esto signa sint infidelium, qui, quoniam sermoni et doctrinae credere noluerunt, signis adducantur ad fidem: et dominus incredulis signa faciebat, et tamen non idcirco domini suggillanda sunt signa, quia illi infideles erant, sed maiori admirationi erunt, quia tantae fuere potentiae, ut etiam mentes durissimas edomarent, et ad fidem cogerent. **5** Itaque nolo mihi dicas: signa infidelium sunt, sed responde quomodo in uilissimo puluere et fauilla nescio qua tanta sit signorum uirtutumque praesentia. **6** Sentio, sentio, infelicissime mortalium, quid doleas, quid timeas. **7** Spiritus iste immundus qui haec te cogit scribere saepe hoc “uilissimo” tortus est “puluere,” immo hodieque torquetur, et qui in te plagas dissimulat, in ceteris confitetur. **8** Nisi forte in morem gentilium impiorumque Porphyrii et Eunomii has praestigias daemonum esse confingas et non uere clamare daemones, sed sua simulare tormenta, do consilium: ingredere basilicas martyrum et aliquando purgaberis. **9** Inuenies ibi multos socios tuos et nequaquam cereis martyrum, qui tibi displicent, sed flammis inuisibilibus combureris, et tunc fateberis, quod nunc negas, et tuum nomen, qui in Vigilantio loqueris, libere proclamaris:

He makes arguments against the signs and miracles that occur in the basilicas of the martyrs, and he says that they are useful for unbelievers, not believers, as if the important question to answer is for whom they occur, not by what miracle. Let us grant that they are the signs for unbelievers who, because they were unwilling to believe in speech and doctrine, are brought to the faith through signs, and the Lord made these signs for them. Nevertheless, the signs of the Lord must not take a beating because those people were without faith; instead, they will be a source of greater admiration because their power was great enough to subdue the most stubborn minds and compel them to the faith. Therefore, do not tell me that they are merely signs for the unbelieving; tell me instead how there is such a great presence of signs and miracles in “the vilest dust and ash, whatever it is.” I sense it, I sense, you most wretched of mortals, why you are pained and what you fear. That unclean spirit which forces you to write these things has often been tortured by the same “worthless dust;” more correctly, he is still tortured today, and even though he keeps his wounds secret in you, he reveals them in others. Unless perhaps in the fashion of the heathen and wicked men, Porphyry and Eunomius, you should pretend that these are the tricks of demons: that they do not really cry out, but fake their own torments, here is some advice: enter the basilicas of the martyrs, and you will be cleansed at any time. There, you will find many of your associates and you will be set ablaze not by the candles of the martyrs, which displease you, but by invisible flames. Then, you will confess what you now deny, and you will freely proclaim your name, you who speak within Vigilantius.

te esse aut Mercurium propter nummorum cupiditatem aut Nocturnum iuxta Plauti *Amphitryonem*, quo dormiente in Alcmenae adulterio, duas noctes Iuppiter copulauit, ut magnae fortitudinis hercules nasceretur aut certe Liberum patrem pro ebrietate et cantharo ex humeris dependente et semper rubente facie et spumantibus labiis effrenatisque conuiciis.

Chapter XI

1 Unde et in hac prouincia cum subitus terrae motus noctis medio omnes de somno excitasset, tu prudentissimus et sapientissimus mortalium nudus orabas, et referebas nobis Adam et Euam de paradiso. **2** Et illi quidem apertis oculis erubuerunt nudos se esse cernentes et uerenda texerunt arborum foliis: tu et tunica et fide nudus subitoque timore perterritus et aliquid habens nocturnae crapulae, sanctorum oculis obscenam partem corporis ingerebas ut tuam indicares prudentiam. **3** Tales habet aduersarios ecclesia: hi duces contra martyrum sanguinem dimicant, huiuscemodi oratores contra apostolos per-tonant, imo tam rabidi canes contra Christi latrant discipulos.

Chapter XII

1 Ego confiteor timorem meum, ne forsitan de superstitione descendat. **2** Quando iratus fuero et aliquid mali in meo animo cogitauero et me nocturnum phantasma deluserit, basilicas martyrum intrare non audeo. **3** Ita totus et animo et corpore pertremesco. **4** Rideas forsitan et muliercularum deliramenta subsannes. uiderunt

You will proclaim that you are either Mercury on account of your desire for money, or Nocturnus, from Plautus' *Amphitryon*, for while he was sleeping, Jupiter had sex with his wife, Alcmena, for two nights, resulting in the birth of powerful Hercules. Or, you are Father Liber, of course, because of his drunkenness and the flask that hung from his shoulders; he was always red-faced, foaming at the mouth, and full of irrepressible insults.

And at one time, in this province, a sudden earthquake in the middle of the night roused everyone from sleep; you, most sensible and wisest of mortals, were praying in the nude - you were clearly reenacting Adam and Eve from Paradise. They, upon opening their eyes, blushed when they saw that they were naked and covered their shameful parts with tree leaves. You, however, with no tunic and no faith, suddenly froze in fear and still exhibiting signs of the night's drinking binge, you were forcing the indecent part of your body upon the holy men's eyes in order to reveal your sense of discretion. Such are the adversaries of the church! These generals fight against the blood of the martyrs; orators of this sort bellow against the apostles; or, rather, such are the rabid dogs that bark against Christ's disciples.

I confess my fear so that it not seem to stem from any superstition. Whenever I am angry, and think something evil in my mind, and a spirit deceives me during the night, I do not dare to enter the basilicas of the martyrs. In much the same way, I tremble all over in my body and mind. You may laugh, perhaps, and you may grin at these thoughts as women's nonsense.

5 Non erubesco earum fidem, quae primae dominum resurgentem, quae mittuntur ad apostolos, quae in matre domini saluatoris sanctis apostolis commendantur. **6** Tu ructato cum saeculi hominibus, ego ieiunabo cum feminis, immo cum religiosis uiris, qui pudicitiam uultu praeferunt et pallida iugi continentia ora portantes, Christi ostendunt uerecundiam.

Chapter XII

1 Videris mihi dolere et aliud, ne, si inoleuerit apud Gallos continentia et sobrietas atque ieiunium, tabernae tuae lucra non habeant et uigilias diaboli ac temulenta conuiuia tota nocte exercere non possis. **2** Praeterea eisdem ad me relatum est epistulis quod contra auctoritatem apostoli Pauli, immo Petri, Iohannis et Iacobi, qui dextras dederunt Paulo et Barnabae communicationis et praeceperunt eis ut pauperum memores essent, tu prohibeas Hierosolymam in usus sanctorum aliqua sumptuum solacia dirigi. **3** Videlicet si ad haec respondero, statim latrabis meam me causam agere, qui tanta cunctos largitate donasti, ut, nisi uenisses Hierosolymam et tuas uel patronorum tuorum pecunias effudisses, omnes periclitaremur fame. **4** Ego hoc loquor quod beatus apostolus Paulus in cunctis paene epistulis suis loquitur et praecepit: in ecclesiis gentium per unam sabbati, hoc est die dominico, omnes conferre debere quae Hierosolymam in sanctorum solacia dirigantur, et uel per discipulos suos uel per quos ipsi probauerint, et, si dignum fuerit, ipse aut dirigat aut perferat quod collectum est. **5** In Actibus quoque apostolorum loquens ad Felicem praesidem:

I am not ashamed of the faith of these women who first saw the risen Lord, who were sent to the apostles, who, in the mother of the Lord, Savior, were commended to the holy apostles. Go and belch with your secular men; I will fast with women, nay, with religious men who display their chastity in their faces, and, their cheeks pale from constant abstinence, reveal the modesty of Christ.

It seems to me that you are troubled by something else. You fear that if continence, sobriety, and fasting should take root among the people of Gaul, then your taverns would start to lose revenue and you would no longer be able to practice the devil's vigils and your drunken parties every night. In addition, I have been informed in the same letters that you were in opposition to the authority of Paul, or, rather, Peter, John, and Jacob, who have given the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas, and who commanded them to be mindful of the poor. Instead, I hear that you are preventing any financial relief from being sent to Jerusalem to assist the saints. Of course, if I respond to these things, you will immediately start yapping that I am pleading my own case; for you were so generous to everyone that, if you had not come to Jerusalem and opened your wallet or that of your patrons, we would all have wasted away from starvation. I am saying what the blessed Apostle Paul says and advises in nearly all of his Epistles; he gives a request to the churches of his people that, on the first day of the Sabbath, that is, the day of the Lord, everyone ought to contribute to what will be sent to Jerusalem for the relief of the saints, either through his disciples, or through those of whom they themselves approve; and if it be appropriate, he should send it himself, or carry what was collected. Also, in the Acts of the Apostles, addressing Felix, the governor, he said,

“Post annos,” ait, “plures elemosynas factururus in gentem meam ueni, et oblationes et uota in quibus inuenerunt me purificatum in templo.” **6** Numquid in alia parte terrarum et in his ecclesiis quas nascentes fide sua erudiebat, quae ab aliis acceperat diuidere non poterat? **7** Sed sanctis pauperibus dare cupiebat, qui suas pro Christo facultatulas relinquentes ad Domini seruitutem tota mente conuersi sunt. **8** Longum est nunc si de cunctis epistulis eius omnia testimonia reuoluere uoluerim in quibus hoc agit et tota mente festinat, ut Hierosolymam et ad sancta loca credentibus pecuniae dirigantur, non in auaritiam, sed in refrigerium, non ad diuitias congregandas, sed ad imbecillitatem corpusculi sustentandam et frigus atque inediam declinandam; hac in Iudaea usque hodie perseuerante consuetudine, non solum apud nos, sed etiam apud Hebraeos, ut, qui in lege Domini meditantur die ac nocte et patrem non habent in terra nisi solum deum synagogarum et totius orbis foueantur ministeriis, ex aequalitate dumtaxat, non ut aliis refrigerium et aliis sit tribulatio, sed ut aliorum abundantia aliorum sustentet inopiam.

Chapter XIV

1 Respondebis hoc unumquemque in patria sua posse facere nec pauperes defuturos, qui ecclesiae opibus sustentandi sint. **2** Nec nos negamus cunctis pauperibus etiam Iudaeis et Samaritanis, si tanta sit largitas, stipes porrigendas; sed apostolus docet faciendam quidem ad omnes elemosynam, sed maxime ad domesticos fidei. **3** De quibus et Saluator in Euangelio loquebatur: *“Facite uobis amicos de iniquo mammona, qui uos recipiant in aeterna tabernacula.”*

“After many years, I came to Jerusalem to give alms to my people as well as offerings and vows, during which they found me purified in the temple.” Why, could he not distribute what he had received from others in another part of the world and the churches that, in their nascent stage, he was teaching in the manner of his own faith? But he desired to provide for the holy poor who abandoned their meager possessions for Christ’s sake and turned to serving God with all their hearts. It would be no brief task if I were willing to recite all of the passages from the collection of his letters in which he makes his case and presses enthusiastically that money be sent to Jerusalem and the holy places for believers. This is to be accomplished not for greed, but for refreshment; not for gathering riches, but for supporting the weakness of the infirm body and to reduce cold and hunger. This custom continues in Judaea, even to the present day, not only with us, but with the Hebrews, so that they, who meditate upon the Lord day and night and do not have a father in their land save for God alone, may be nourished by the help of the synagogues and of the whole world; that, for equality’s sake, there may not be refreshment for some and hardship for others, but that the abundance of some may help the need of others.

You will respond that any person can do this in his own land and that there will be no lack of poor people to be supported by the resources of the Church. We do not deny that small offerings ought to be extended to all the poor, even the Jews and the Samaritans, if there were such a great bounty. But the Apostle teaches that we must give alms to everyone, but especially to those of our faith. The Savior speaks of them in the Gospel: *“Make for yourselves friends from the mammon of iniquity, so that they may receive you into everlasting abodes.”*

4 Numquid et isti pauperes, inter quorum pannos et illuuiem corporis flagrans libido dominatur, possunt habere aeterna tabernacula, qui nec praesentia possident nec futura? **5** Non enim simpliciter pauperes, sed pauperes spiritu beati appellantur, de quibus scriptum est: *“Beatus qui intellegit super egenum et pauperem: in die mala liberabit eum Dominus.”* **6** In uulgi pauperibus sustentandis nequaquam intellectu, sed eleemosyna opus est. **7** In sanctis pauperibus beatitudo est intelligentiae ut ei tribuatur, qui erubescit accipere, et, cum acceperit, dolet, metens carnalia et seminans spiritalia. **8** Quod autem adserit melius eos facere, qui utantur rebus suis et paulatim fructus possessionum pauperibus diuidant, quam illos, qui possessionibus uenundatis semel omnia largiantur, non a me ei, sed a Domino respondebitur: *“Si uis esse perfectus, uade, uende omnia quae habes et da pauperibus et ueni sequere me.”* **9** Ad eum loquitur qui uult esse perfectus, qui cum apostolis patrem, nauiculam et rete dimittit. **10** Iste quem tu laudas secundus aut tertius gradus est; quem et nos recipimus, dummodo sciamus prima secundis et tertiis praeferenda.

Chapter XV

1 Nec a suo studio monachi deterrendi sunt ad elinguis uiperarum morsus saeuissimos, quibus argumentatur et dicit: SI OMNES SE RECLAUSERINT ET FUERINT IN SOLITUDINE, QUIS CELEBRABIT ECCLESIAS, QUIS SAECULARES HOMINES LUCRIFICIET, QUIS PECCANTES AD VIRTUTES POTERIT COHORTARI? **2** Hoc enim modo si omnes tecum fatui sint, sapiens esse quis poterit?

As for those poor people, with their tattered clothes and filthy bodies, whom a raging lust dominates - are they able to have everlasting abodes even though they possess neither present nor future prospects? It is not simply the poor, but the poor in spirit who are called blessed. Of them it is written: *“Blessed is he who gives thought to the poor and the needy: on the evil day, the Lord will deliver him.”* In aiding the poor of the common people, understanding is not what is needed, but rather, alms. In the case of the holy poor, there is a blessed understanding that it be given to one who blushes when receiving and grieves once he has received, reaping material things while sowing spiritual things. Moreover, as to his assertion that the people who enjoy their own goods and divide the fruits of their possessions little by little with the poor are acting better than those who sell all of their possessions and give them all away at once, not I, but the Lord will respond: *“If you wish to be perfect, come, sell all that you have, and give to the poor: come, follow me.”* He speaks to the one who wishes to be perfect, who, with the apostles, leaves his father, ship, and net. The man whom you praise is of second or third tier. We still receive him so long as we understand that the first is preferred to the second, the second to the third.

Monks must not be deterred from their pursuits to respond to an inarticulate viper that, with the most savage bites, makes his case and says: “If everyone closed himself off and remained in the wilderness, who will fill the churches? Who will convert secular men? Who will be able to encourage sinners to virtue?” In the same way, if everyone were dim-witted along with you, who would be able to be wise?

3 Et uirginitas non erit approbanda, si enim omnes uirgines fuerint, nuptiae non erunt, interibit humanum genus, infantes in cunis non uagient, obstetrices absque mercedibus mendicabunt et grauissimo frigore solus atque contractus Dormitanti uigilabit in lectulo. **4** Rara est uirtus nec a pluribus appetitur. **5** Atque utinam hoc omnes essent quod pauci sunt, de quibus dicitur: **6** “*Multi uocati, pauci electi,*” et uacui essent carceres. Monachus autem non doctoris habet, sed plangentis officium, qui uel se uel mundum lugeat et Domini pauidus praestoletur aduentum, qui sciens imbecillitatem suam et uas fragile quod portat, timet offendere, ne impingat et corruat atque frangatur. **7** Unde et mulierum maximeque adulescentularum uitat aspectum et in tantum castigatorem sui est, ut etiam quae tuta sunt pertimescat.

Chapter XVI

1 Cur, inquires, pergis ad heremum? **2** Videlicet ut te non audiam, non uideam, ut tuo furore non mouear, ut tua bella non patiar, ne me capiat oculus meretricis, ne forma pulcherrima ad illicitos ducat amplexus. **3** Respondebis: hoc non est pugnare, sed fugere. **4** Sta in acie, aduersariis armatus obsiste, ut postquam uiceris coroneris. **5** Fateor imbecillitatem meam. **6** Nolo spe pugnare uictoriae ne perdam aliquando uictoriam. **7** Si fugero, gladium deuitaui. **8** Si stetero, aut uincendum mihi est, aut cadendum. **9** Quid autem necesse est certa dimittere et incerta sectari? **10** Aut scuto aut pedibus mors uitanda est. **11** Tu qui pugnas, et superari potes et uincere. **12** Ego cum fugero, non uincor in eo quod fugio, sed ideo fugio, ne uincar.

Also, virginity will not have to be endorsed; for if everyone were a virgin, there will be no marriages: the human race will perish, children will not wail in their cradles; midwives will go begging without their wages, and Dormitanti, alone and shriveled from the severe cold, will lie awake in his little bed. Virtue is rare and is not sought by most people. If only everyone could be what the few are, about whom it is written: “*Many are called, few are chosen,*” and that the prisons were empty. Moreover, the monk does not have the duty of a teacher, but of a lamenter who either grieves for himself or the world, and fearful of the Lord waits for his coming. He also knows his own weakness, and he is afraid to stumble, lest he strike the fragile vessel he is carrying and it drop and break. For this reason, he shuns the sight of women, especially adolescent women, and he punishes himself so much that he even fears what is safe.

“Why,” you will ask, “do you head for the desert?” To avoid seeing and hearing you, of course; to not be agitated by your madness; to not endure your campaigns; so that a glance from a prostitute may not tempt me; so that a very lovely shape not lead me to illicit embraces. You will respond, “This is not fighting, but fleeing. Stand firm in the battleline, stand armed to face your adversaries so that you may be crowned after your victory.” I confess my own weakness. I do not wish to fight with a hope of victory, lest I lose that victory at some point. If I flee, I have avoided the sword; if I stand fast, I either conquer or fall. Why, then, is it necessary to cast aside what is certain and pursue what is not? One must avoid death either with a shield or with one’s feet. You, a fighter, can either conquer or be conquered. When I flee, I am not conquered because I am fleeing; I flee so that I may not be conquered.

13 Nulla securitas est uicino serpente dormire. **14** Potest fieri ut me non mordeat. **15** Tamen potest fieri ut aliquando me mordeat. **16** Matres uocamus sorores et filias et non erubescimus uitiis nostris nomina pietatis obtendere. **17** Quid facit monachus in cellulis feminarum? **18** Quid sibi uolunt sola et priuata colloquia et arbitrorum fugientes oculos? **19** Sanctus amor impatientiam non habet. **20** Quod de libidine diximus, referamus ad auaritiam et ad omnia uitia, quae uitantur solitudine. **21** Et idcirco urbium frequentias declinamus, ne facere compellamur quae nos non tam natura cogit facere quam uoluntas.

Chapter XVII

1 Haec, ut dixi, sanctorum presbyterorum rogatu unius noctis lucubratione dictaui, festinante admodum fratre Sisinnio et propter sanctorum refrigeria Aegyptum ire properante. **2** Alioquin et ipsa materia apertam habuit blasphemiam, quae indignationem magis scribentis quam testimoniorum multitudinem flagitaret. **3** Quod si Dormitantius in mea rursus maledicta uigilauerit et eodem ore blasphemo, quo apostolos et martyres lacerat, de me quoque putauerit detrahendum, nequaquam illi breui lucubratione, sed tota nocte uigilabo et sociis illius, immo discipulis uel magistris, qui, nisi tumentes uteros uiderint feminaurum, maritos earum Christi ministerio arbitrantur indignos.

There is no freedom from anxiety sleeping next to a serpent. It is possible that it will not bite me; it is also possible that it will. We call them mothers, sisters, and daughters, and we do not blush to draw the names of familial affection over our sins. What business does a monk have in women's cells? Why do they want private meetings, even fleeing the eyes of witnesses? Holy love does not have intolerance. What we have said concerning desire, let us apply to greed and to all the vices that are avoided through solitude. For this very reason, we shun the crowds of the cities so that we may not feel compelled to do what desire, and not nature, compels us to do.

At the request, as I have said, of the holy presbyters, I have dictated these words in the space of a single night's work since my brother, Sisinnius, is in a hurry and is hastening to go to Egypt so that he may provide aid to the saints; in other respects, the material itself was so openly blasphemous that it demanded the indignation of the writer more than a multitude of arguments. But if Dormitantius stays up late in response to my slander, and if, with that same blasphemous mouth that he used to lash the apostles and martyrs, he thinks that I, too, should be dragged down in the mud, I will not merely stay up late; I will spend the entire night working against his allies, or rather his students or teachers, who, unless they see women's bellies swollen, judge their husbands to be unworthy of Christ's ministry.

Commentary

Chapter I

Jerome began his treatise with a priamel before briefly outlining Vigilantius' main teachings. A priamel is defined by Bundy as "a focusing or selecting device in which one or more terms serves as foil for the point of particular interest" in Bundy, E.L. 1962. *Studia Pindarica*.

Berkeley: University of California Press, p.5. There follows a foreshadowing of the more elaborate insults to come: making fun of Vigilantius' origins, tying him to other heretics, etc. The first sentence well encapsulates Jerome's preference throughout the rest of the work for combining scriptural and classical exempla and references in order to demolish his opponent.

1.1 *Multa in orbe monstra generata sunt: centauros et sirenas, ululas et onocrotalos in Esaia legimus. Iob Leviathan et Behemoth mystico sermone describit.*

Many monsters have populated the world: we read of centaurs, sirens, owls and pelicans in Isaiah. Job describes the Leviathan and Behemoth in his mystic language.

Jerome, by listing monsters from different sources, demonstrates his belief that Vigilantius qualified as a monster in any world. He began the *Aduersus Iovinianum* 1.1 with a list as well, but not as a priamel, comparing Jovinian's incomprehensible language with that of prophets in Classical literature.

Has quidem praeter Sibyllam leget nemo. Nam diuinandum est. Furiosas Apollinis uates legimus; et illud Virgilianum: Dat sine mente sonum. Heraclitum quoque cognomento σκοτεινὸν, sudantes philosophi uix intelligunt. Sed quid ad nostrum αἰνιγματισταί, cuius libros multo difficilior est nosse, quam uincere?

No one reads these texts except for Sibyl, for it must be divined. We read of the mad prophetesses of Apollo, and what Virgil says about giving a sound without a mind. Toiling philosophers are hardly able to understand Heraclitus, also, by the nickname "Obscure." But what are riddlers to us, whose books are much more difficult to comprehend than to refute?

Here, Jerome focused in on the exceptionally abstruse nature of Jovinian's writing by comparing him with Sibyl and Heraclitus. The introduction for Vigilantius is more elaborate, however, and

is unique in Jerome's works, highlighting how well Jerome established the precise tone and mood of the treatise to come with a grand display of rhetoric. The introduction may appear to be a simple list of monsters, or, for the learned reader, a priamel not unlike the many examples that begin a Classical poem (*multa in orbe monstra generata sunt*). For other examples and a comprehensive study, see Race, W.H. 1982. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*.

Leiden: Brill. But Jerome was more sophisticated than this. First, he gave a nod to Claudian's *In Rufinum* 1.285-296:

una Cleonaeum pascebat silua leonem;	285
Arcadiae saltum uastabat dentibus unum	
saeuus aper, tuque, o compressa matre rebellans,	
non ultra Libyae fines, Antaeae, nocebas	
solaque fulmineo resonabat Creta iuuenco	
Lernaeamque uirens obsederat hydra paludem.	290
hoc monstrum non una palus, non una tremebat	
insula, sed Latia quidquid dicione subactum	
diuidit a primis Gangem horrebat Hiberis.	
hoc neque Geryones triplex nec turbidus Orci	
ianitor aequabit nec si concurrat in unum	295
uis hydrae Scyllaeque fames et flamma Chimaerae.	

'Twas but one wood that sheltered the lion of Cleonae, the savage boar's tusks laid waste a single Arcadian vale, and thou, rebel Antaeus, holding thy mother earth in thine embrace, didst no hurt beyond the borders of Africa. Crete alone re-echoed to the bellowings of the fire-breathing bull, and the green hydra beleaguered no more than Lerna's lake. But this monster Rufinus terrified not one lake nor one island: whatsoever lives beneath the Roman rule, from distant Spain to Ganges' stream, was in fear of him. Neither triple Geryon nor Hell's fierce janitor can vie with him nor could the conjoined terrors of powerful Hydra, ravenous Scylla, and fiery Chimaera. (trans. Platnauer)

Not only do the two authors use Herculean labors within a priamel, but both examples show the limits of terrestrial geography. Each of these monsters corresponds to each author's target, and both targets symbolize an evil that surpasses all these mythical creatures.

centauros: An important part of the priamel, in addition to its allusive background, is the structure. Every creature juxtaposed with Vigilantius was deliberately chosen, named in swift

succession, moving geographically closer to the monster of Gaul. Jerome began his list of monsters with centaurs, part human and part horse. Centaurs were famously dissolute and foreshadow Vigilantius and followers. The traditional reputation of centaurs, with the exceptions of Chiron (Hyg. *Fab.* 274.9) and Pholus, for his tolerance of liquor (Apoll. 2.5.4), is that they cannot handle their wine (Hom. *Od.* 21.293-8). Jerome referred to Vigilantius' fondness for wine in this text and also in *Ep.* 61.3. In the *Vita Pauli* 7, Anthony came across a centaur who was difficult to understand: *barbarum nescio quid infrendens, et frangens potius uerba quam proloquens, inter horrentia ora setis, blandum quaesiuit alloquium*. Jerome's description of a centaur complements his use of the creature in this text, as Jerome soon contrasted Vigilantius with the "viris semper fortibus et eloquentissimis" of Gaul. This particular Gallic monster is no Cicero. In his work on Euripides, the hyper-rationalist Verrall supposed that a run-in with bandits in the mountains might be the true story behind Hercules' skirmish with centaurs. See Verrall, A.W. 1905. *Four Plays of Euripides*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. The close association between centaurs and bandits adds another layer, as Jerome will soon explain that Vigilantius' nature stems too much from his upbringing near bandits (*CV* 2, 4). See also Cox Miller, P. 1996. "Jerome's Centaur: A Hyper-Icon of the Desert." *JECS* 4 (2):209-33. In this article, Jerome's centaur in his *VPauli* was fancifully read as a representation of the ascetic self. Classical heroes had to contend with monsters such as these; vanquishing Vigilantius was no less a labor for Jerome. The logical conclusion is that, much like the monsters listed, Vigilantius will be destroyed. For Jerome wielding the "club of Hercules" see Layton, R. 2002. "Plagiarism and Lay Patronage of Ascetic Scholarship: Jerome, Ambrose and Rufinus." *JECS* 10: 489-522, especially 514-15.

sirenas: In Classical mythology, there were two types of sirens; first, the dangerous songstresses found in the *Odyssey* where Odysseus cleverly avoids hearing their song (12.39-54; 12.158-200), and in the story of Jason and the Argonauts (Apoll. Rhod. 4.891-919; 4.1264-1290). Sirens in the Bible, however, are more demonic beings, identified by Cyril of Alexandria in his *Comm. in Is.* (PG 70.908D; 748A; 364D) with the night-owl (see the following note). As with the former, however, these creatures were similarly viewed as symbols of temptation: Ambr. *Exp. Christ.* 3.1.4; Paul. *Ep.* 16.7; Max. Tur. *Serm.* 37.2. In *Comm. in Is.* 5.13.20, Jerome wrote: “*Sirenae autem THENNIM uocantur, quas nos aut daemones aut monstra quaedam uel certe dracones magnos interpretabimur.*” Jerome also likened sirens to heretics, whose songs deceive any listener (*Comm. in Mic.* 1.1).

ululas: The screech owl’s cries were considered ill-omened (e.g. Varr. *LL* 5.11.75). There might be a play here on the fact that owls’ cries are especially frightening because they are heard at night when Vigilantius discourages vigils. Jerome also noted in his *Comm. in Is.* 5.13.20 that, “*Pro ululis quoque omnes ipsum uerbum hebraicum HIHIM, soli LXX onocentauros transtulerunt.*” The mythical and biblical connection between these demonic creatures elevates the tone of Jerome’s list further.

onocrotalos: The pelican also has negative associations, known for building its nest in deserted places (Zeph. 2:14; Ps. 102:6). Eventually, it came to signify the passion of Christ, for the bird was thought to kill her children and, three days later, have compassion and revive them with her blood (e.g. *Physiol.* 6). As early as Augustine, however, the pelican in *Ps.* 101:7 was understood as Christ (*En. in Ps.* 101.7): *uenerit inter aliquos ubi Christiani non sunt; pelicanus est in solitudine.*

Isaiah: The first passage is 13:21: *Et respondebut ululae in aedibus eius, et sirenae in delubris uoluptatis*. The second passage is 34:11ff.: *Et possidebunt illam onocrotalus, et hericius, et ibis, et coruus habitabunt in ea, et extendetur super eam mensura, ut redigatur ad nihili, et perpendicularum in desolationem...Et occurrent daemonia onocentauris, et pilosus clamabit alter ad alterum*. Both passages discuss which creatures will possess and dwell in lands post-destruction. Not only do these creatures inhabit the far reaches of the earth, but they are also portentous.

Iob: Jerome continued with Behemoth and Leviathan in Job (3:8, 40:15ff.).

Leuiathan: The Leviathan is mentioned in Job 40 as a sea monster that only God may destroy and is sometimes equated with Satan. Jer. *Comm. in Is.* 6.14.21: *legimus in euangelio quod diabolus ab initio mendax sit et pater eius, id est mendacii, quod multi non intellegentes, patrem diaboli uolunt esse draconem, qui regnet in mari, quem Hebraei appellant Leuiathan; ibid.* 8.27 passim.

Behemoth: Likewise in Job 40:11. Origen identified Behemoth with Satan: *De princ.* 1.5.5; *in psalm.* 37 *hom.* 1.6, etc.

mystico sermone: Jerome mentioned that Job spoke using *mystico sermone*, that is, the cryptic language used by the prophets. Jerome used this phrase at least 25 times to describe the words of the prophets. While centaurs and sirens dwell near the edges of the world in remote places, wilderness and seaside, respectively, and the owl and pelican haunt the skies, the Leviathan and Behemoth are both associated with the water itself. All of these creatures are a gloss on Jerome's opening words "*monstra in orbe.*"

1.2 *Cerberum et Stympthalidas aprumque Erymanthium et leonem Nemeaeum, chimaeram atque hydram multorum capitum narrant fabulae poetarum.*

Cerberus, the Stymphalian birds, the Erymanthian boar, the Nemean lion, the Chimera and the many-headed Hydra – all of these are mentioned in the fables of poets.

Cerberum: The monsters that follow continue to cover the Mediterranean. Starting from Cerberus comes a partial list of the labors of Hercules. Jerome reversed the typical order of labors (Apoll. 2.5.1 ff.), with the exception of the Chimera and the Hydra. One expects the lion as the first labor and Cerberus the last, not the other way around as Jerome has it here. The birds and the boar are in order, but the fact that the first and last are reversed is what is most striking. Jerome is listing them thus to move geographically closer to Gaul, to put into relief the fact that all corners of the world have seen monsters come and go, but not Gaul. Cf. Feiertag (2005a, 31), who lists Hyginus as a source for Jerome's list of labors and other mythical beings. However, the Herculean labors are clearly presented in a reverse order and do not suggest any reliance on Hyginus. Cerberus starts the list in the Underworld, then the Nemean Lion in the Argolid.

chimaeram atque hydram: However, Jerome removed the Hydra from the list of labors and instead paired it with the Chimera much as Hyginus does (Hyg. *Fab. praef.*), grouping them together because they were both born of Typhon and Echidna. Hes. *Theog.* 306ff. listed their offspring in the following order: Orthus, Cerberus, Hydra, Chimaera, the Sphinx, and the Nemean Lion. Typhon is associated with Etna (Pind. *Ol.* 4.6-7), which might place the hydra and chimaera a little bit closer to Gaul. Verg. *Aen.* 6.287-88, lists the Hydra and Chimaera together as well in the Underworld. That the Hydra is listed first then Chimaera is not problematic, as *chimaera* works at the end of a hexameter line, as in Claud. *In Ruf.* 1.294.

hydra: The Hydra reared its gruesome heads again in Jerome's *Comm. in Ezek.* prol., written in 414: *scorpiusque inter Enceladum et Porphyrionem Trinacriae humo premitur et hydra multorum capitum contra nos aliquando sibilare cessavit, datumque tempus quo non haereticorum respondere insidiis*. See Kelly, *Jerome*, 306 for the dating. Scholars have

interpreted Rufinus as the hydra here; for example, Bury, J.B. 1904. "The Origin of Pelagius." *Hermathena* 13: 26-35; Jamieson, K. 1987. "Jerome, Augustine and the Stesichoran Palinode." *Rhetorica* 5.4: 353-67.

There is no definitive proof of this, however, other than Rufinus' death in 395 before this commentary was written. While Rufinus is certainly a likely target, especially as a scorpion (*Ep.* 127.10), it is possible that, because there is a unique phrase (*respondere insidiis*), the hydra might be in reference to Vigilantius or those associated with his heresy, such as his predecessor, Jovinian. Such is the nature of the Hydra, to grow another head after one has been severed.

1.3-4 *Cacum describit Vergilius. Triformem Geryonem Hispaniae prodiderunt.*

Virgil also describes the monster Cacus. Spain has produced the triple-bodied Geryon.

Cacus: This monster is a native of Italy: Verg. *Aen.* 8.190-279; Liv. 1.7.3-15; Prop. 4.9; Ov. *Fast.* 1.543-586. Much like the centaur, Cacus was known as a hybrid creature: Verg. *Aen.* 8.193.

Geryonem: Lastly, Jerome listed Geryon as a monster from Spain: Hes. *Theog.* 287-94; Apollod. 2.106-9; Verg. *Aen.* 6.289; Hor. *carm.* 2.14.7f. Several of these monsters also appeared in Jerome's *Comm. in Dan.* 1.4: *scyllam quoque et chimaeram, hydram atque centauros, aues et feras, flores et arbores, stellas et lapides factos ex hominibus narrant fabulae.*

1.5 *Sola Gallia monstra non habuit, sed uiris semper fortibus et eloquentissimis abundauit.*

Gaul alone did not have monsters, overflowing instead with invariably brave and very eloquent men.

Of all the places in the world, only Gaul appears to have been free of monsters. Instead, Gaul was full of the bravest and most eloquent men. Jerome probably had in mind the fame of the Gallic schools (Jer. *Ep.* 125.6: *ubertatem Gallici nitoremque sermonis*) and the success of its panegyrists. One thinks of the corpus of 11 Gallic *Panegyrici Latini*. Gauls were famous for their

eloquence long before Vigilantius proved to be an exception (Quint. *Inst.* 10.3.13: *in eloquentia Galliarum*). See further Haarhoff, T.J. 1920. *Schools of Gaul: A Study of Pagan and Christian Education in the Last Century of the Western Empire*. London: Oxford University Press.

1.6 *Exortus est subito Vigilantius <immo> Dormitantius, qui immundo spiritu pugnet contra Christi Spiritum et martyrum neget sepulcra ueneranda, damnandas dicat esse uigilias et numquam nisi in Pascha alleluia cantandum, continentiam haeresim, pudicitiam libidinis seminarium.*

But suddenly there arose Vigilantius, nay, Dormitantius, to fight against the spirit of Christ with his own unclean spirit and criticize the veneration of martyrs' tombs, to claim that vigils are condemnable, that no one should ever sing "Hallelujah" unless it is Easter, that continence is heresy, chastity the breeding ground for desire.

exortus: Yet from this abundance of excellent men, Vigilantius arose. The verb *exortus* frequently appears with *subito* or *repente*, cf. Cic. *Agr.*3.3.10: *repentinus Sulla nobis exoritur*. Up to this point, the other monsters have all been objects of description or creation. Vigilantius, being the subject of *exortus*, is portrayed as a more active and, therefore, more dangerous enemy. The verb at the start of the sentence, as opposed to the previous verb-final sentences and clauses, also highlights the perverseness of this monstrous character by throwing the suddenness of his appearance into relief. Augustine frequently used *exorior* to describe the arrival of a heresy: *Adnot. in Iob* 36; *CF* 13.4; *De doct. Christ.* 3.33; *De grat.*; *De haer.* 72, *ibid.* 88.

Dormitantius: This monster also has more than one name. Jerome called Vigilantius Dormitantius before; cf. *Ep.* 61.4.2; 109.1 and 3. Cf. Wiesen, D.S. 1964. *St. Jerome as a Satirist: A Study in Christian Latin Thought and Letters*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 220. On the role of nicknames in the literary culture of late antique Gaul, see Mathisen, R. 1991. "Phoebus, Orpheus, and Dionysus: Nicknames and the Literary Circle of Sidonius" in *Studies in the History, Literature and Society of Late Antiquity*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, pp. 29-44. Feiertag's text reads *Vigilantius Dormitantius*, which cannot be correct. I follow the readings of

P.I.s.l.a.m. Em Met. (2005a, 6). They read *immo*, which would make far better sense in this context. Dormitanti in apposition does little to drive home the insulting nickname – one that Jerome is more than pleased to elaborate upon, e.g. *Ep.* 109.1: *Vigilantium, qui κατ' ἀντίφρασιν hoc vocatur nomine, nam Dormitanti rectius diceretur*. Several editors have inserted *seu uerius* after Vigilanti for the same reason, although Jerome never used this phrase elsewhere. He did, however, use *immo* to offer an alternative name in his *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 2.15: *dicit Eusebius, immo, ut tu uis, Pamphilus*. This type of contrast with *immo* sets up the joke a little further in the sentence where Jerome mocked Vigilanti for saying that vigils ought to be condemned. See below.

Compared with the opening catalogue, Jerome next provides a different kind of list: the difficult teachings of Vigilanti, or labors, that Jerome would have to perform. Jerome left out some of the topics that he would mention later (e.g. lighting of candles).

alleluia: While Alleluia was sung during Easter, it was also sung on other occasions. In some of his sermons and explanations of the Psalms, Augustine discusses the meaning of *alleluia* and how it may be sung on specific days or at other times. Aug. *En. in Ps.* 106.1: *alleluia certis diebus cantamus, sed omni die cogitamus; Serm.* 256: *sed etiam hic inter pericula, inter tentationes, et ab aliis, et a nobis cantetur alleluia*. Jerome, in *Ep.* 108.20 to Eustochium in 404, also describes how Paula founded a monastery and would sing Psalms and chant *alleluia* at specific times every day. In addition, a letter to Damasus by (Ps.-) Jerome spoke in great favor of attaching an *alleluia* to the end of every psalm (*PL* 130.659B-C): *Alleluia semper cum omnibus psalmis affigatur, ut omni loco communiter respondeatur nocturnis temporibus. In ecclesia autem post resurrectionem usque sanctum Pentecosten finiatur, inter dierum spatia tibi soli*

quingagesima propter novitatem sancti Paschae, ut uox ita laudis canatur in Aleph, quod prologus Graece. Latine autem praefatio dicitur.

continentiam, haeresim; pudicitiam, libidinis seminarium: Jerome ended this sentence with a tidy asyndetic pair, following Behaghel's "Law of Increasing Members." Behaghel, O. 1932. *Deutsche Syntax*, vol. 4. Heidelberg: Carl Winters, p.6.

1.7-8 *Et quomodo Euphorbus in Pythagoram renatus esse perhibetur, sic in isto Ioviniani mens praua surrexit, ut et in illo et in hoc diaboli respondere cogamur insidiis. Cui iure dicetur: "Semen pessimum, para filios tuos occisioni peccatis patris sui."*

As Euphorbus is said to have been reborn in Pythagoras, so in Vigilantius the depraved mind of Jovinian was resurrected so that in the former and the latter we are to grapple with the snares of the devil to whom it will be rightly said: "*Most wicked seed, prepare your children for slaughter for the sins of your father.*"

Euphorbus: A Trojan soldier who wounded Patroclus (*Il.* 16.806ff.). See further *LIMC* 4.1.68–9. Pythagoras claimed to that he was Euphorbus in a previous incarnation (*Hor. Carm.* 1.28). With this summary of Vigilantius' key points of contention, Jerome set up a connection between him and another (former) enemy, Jovinian. He explained that much as Euphorbus was reborn in Pythagoras, so too was Jovinian reborn in Vigilantius. Five years earlier in 401, Rufinus had accused Jerome of falsely claiming to have read Pythagoras' letters when it was unlikely that any of his works had survived (*Apol. adv. Hier.* 2.7). Jerome hardly redeemed himself by claiming that he *meant* to say that he had read about Pythagoras in the works of other authors like Cicero and Horace (*Apol.* 3.39).

Joviniani: Jovinian was the victim of a much longer polemical treatise, *Aduersus Iovinianum*, written by Jerome nearly ten years prior in 393. Jovinian promulgated lax views about marriage and asceticism. See Hunter, D. 2007. *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovinianist Controversy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. To add to Vigilantius' heretical lineage, in the *AJ* 2.37, Jerome wrote that Basilides, a heretic known for

licentiousness, was born again as Jovinian, like a second Euphorbus. In addition, there are echoes of the same insults from the *AJ* in this text. (1: Jovinian is productive during a hangover; 3: straitjacket + chains of Hippocrates; 4: describes Jovinian's words as the hissing of a serpent).

isto...hoc: Vigilantius and Jovinian are juxtaposed to graphically show their bond. *Isto*, Vigilantius, is followed immediately by *Ioviniani*, and shortly after *in illo*, Jovinian, is followed immediately by *in hoc*, Vigilantius. Jerome depicts a mirror image of Jovinian, especially with the chiasmic structure. The verb *surrexit* is used nicely and picks up on the striking *exortus* used above to describe Vigilantius' sudden emergence.

Jerome followed the comparison with a quotation from Is. 14.20-21: *non habebis consortium neque cum eis in sepultura tu enim terram disperdisti tu populum occidisti non vocabitur in aeternum semen pessimorum praeparate filios eius occisioni in iniquitate patrum eorum non consurgent nec hereditabunt terram neque implebunt faciem orbis civitatum*. This short citation of Isaiah drives home the point that no relation of Jovinian will succeed.

1.9 *Ille Romanae ecclesiae auctoritate damnatus inter phasides aues et carnes suillas non tam emisit spiritum quam eructavit*.

Jovinian, condemned by the authority of the Roman church, amid Colchian birds and the flesh of swine, did not so much breathe as belch out his last breath.

damnatus: Jovinian was condemned by Siricius and Ambrose in 393, and no one who followed Jovinian could avoid similar condemnation. For the chronology of events related to the Jovinian controversy see Y.-M. Duval. 2003. *L'affaire Jovinien: d'une crise de la société romaine à une crise de la pensée chrétienne à la fin du IV et au début du Ve siècle*. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, pp.11-21.

inter phasides aues carnes suillas: Jerome goes one step further to draw a caricature of Jovinian's luxurious lifestyle, something he also sees revived in Vigilantius. He describes

Jovinian's ignoble death among pheasants. Wiesen, *Satirist*, 223 remarked that these pheasants were "Jerome's standard symbol of gluttony." Cf. *Ep.* 22, 30: *consuetudo lautioris cibi* and also *AJ* 2.6; *Ep.* 54.12, 66.8, 79.7; *Comm. in Zach.* 3.14; *Comm. in Is.* 15.55). In his commentary on Isaiah, Jerome included Colchian pheasants among the delicacies that are promised by millenarians. See Adkin, N. 2003. *Jerome on Virginitate: A Commentary on the Libellus de uirginitate seruanda* (Letter 22). Cambridge: Francis Cairns. He (263 and 287) gave an overview of how Jerome often accused his enemies of gluttony, writing that "the taunt would seem to be unique to him," citing Asterius of Ansedunum (Jerome's student) as an exception. Jovinian died not only having dined on pheasants, but also on pork. He indulged in luxury food items as well as food that was, especially for Jews, unclean. E.g. Is. 65.4, Mt. 8.31. Pigs are also associated with Roman sacrifices and rituals, especially the *suouetaurilia*: Cato, *De Ag.* 141; Tac. *Hist.* 4.53. See CV 2 for more on pigs and Vigilantius.

eructauit: It is worth noting the distinction between the standard use of *eructare* here and the translationese in other Christian texts, where the verb can merely mean "to utter" (*TLL* s.v. 825.85). The setting of Jovinian's death also calls to mind the sumptuous and over-indulgent feasts described in Prudentius' *Psychomachia* 367-70:

inde ad nocturnas epulas, ubi cantharus ingens
despuat effusi spumantia damna Falerni
in mensam cyathis stillantibus, uda ubi multo
fulcra mero ueterique toreumata rore rigantur?

What about the nighttime feasts, where huge vessels spit out foamy and wasteful floods of Falernian wine on the table with dripping ladles, where couches soaked with unmixed wine and embossed furniture are wet with yesterday's dew?

1.10 *Iste caupo Calagurritanus et in peruersum propter nomen uiculi mutus Quintilianus miscet aquam uino, et de artificio pristino suae uenena perfidiae catholicae fidei sociare conatur, impugnare uirginitatem, odisse pudicitiam, in conuiuio saecularium contra sanctorum ieiunia declamare.*

Vigilantius, that innkeeper of Calagurris, that mute Quintilian (on account of the name of his village), mixes water with wine; with this ancient practice, he is attempting to mix the poisons of his treachery with the Catholic faith, to attack virginity, to spread hatred of chastity and, at a feast of secular people, to declaim against the fasting of saints.

Iste: The elaborate comparison of Jovinian and Vigilantius continues here from the previous sentence (*Ille romanae...iste caupo*). While Jovinian could not keep from eating delicious foods, Vigilantius is always surrounded by drink, which, conveniently, had always been available from his childhood.

caupo: The innkeeper had a poor reputation in antiquity and was still viewed as a disreputable during Jerome's time. Rebenich, S. 1992. *Hieronymus und sein Kreis: prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Vol. 72. Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 246-47, saw "caupo" as a mere insult, not as a real identification of Vigilantius' profession, but there is not enough information to support his argument. Jerome might simply be adding the detail as an insult, or wishing to continue rather seamlessly with his preferred metaphor for heresy, *miscet aquam uino*. As a tavern-keeper, Jerome charged Vigilantius with mixing water with wine. Wiesen (*Satirist*, 223) noted that this quotation "is frequently used by Christian writers to describe the dilution of the wine of true religion with the water of heresy, but Jerome also intended it as a slur on the profession of Vigilantius' father," for example: Cyp. *Ep.* 63.13; Ambr. *De fid.* 3.10; Gaud. *Tract.* 19.20. Jerome repeated the metaphor as well; e.g. *Comm. in Is.* 1.1.22; *Comm. in Am.* 1.2. Cf. Ezek. 13:10-16 where false prophets mix old mire with new, weaker cement in order to whitewash falsehood. Whether Vigilantius was a tavern-keeper or not does not affect Jerome's purpose in mentioning his profession here. However, that Jerome chose this particular insult probably indicates that Vigilantius, or his father, was an innkeeper.

Calagurritanus: Not only was Vigilantius an innkeeper, but he was also from Calagurris, modern day Saint-Martory in Comminges. This was meant as a cheap insult, the alliterative

caupo Calagurritanus alone sounds amusing, and Jerome will elaborate on this in Ch.4. Furthermore, there are two Calahorras, in Gaul and in Spain, both of which Jerome evoked in order to compare Vigilantius with Quintilian. Jerome was very careful to make sure that the difference between the two was clear; as such Jerome called him a *mutus Quintilianus*: This is a twist on a compliment offered to excellent Gallic rhetoricians. Cf. Aus. *Prof.* 1. 2: *alter rhetoricae Quintiliane togae*.

Gilly gave a characteristically quaint explanation of how Vigilantius' birthplace determined his character:

It is probably that the birth-place of Vigilantius had much to do in the formation of his character, and that he was indebted to the spot, where he drew his first breath, for that lofty and independent spirit with which he carried with him through life... There is another and a higher advantage in being born a mountaineer. Mountain tribes are generally the most unwilling to receive either the yoke or the corruptions of the stranger: for the children of the mountain and the field are too familiar with the glorious works of God's hands, to take impressions from the childish baubles that foster idolatry (126-7).

miscet aquam uino: See note on *caupo* above.

sociare...impugnare...odisse...declamare: Vigilantius' dilution is expressed in this asyndetic list which leaves the impression that his heretical actions were without end. The parallel alliteration of *in conuiuio saecularium contra sanctorum ieiunia* as well as the chiasmus showcase the antithesis that Jerome saw as problematic: Vigilantius feasts, while virtuous men fast.

1.11-12 *Dum inter phialas philosophatur et ad placentas ligurriens psalmorum modulatione mulcetur, ut tantum inter epulas Dauid et Idithun et Asaph et filiorum Chore cantica audire dignetur. Haec dolentis magis effudi animo quam ridentis, dum me cohibere non possum et iniuriam apostolorum ac martyrum surda nequeo aure transire.*

While he philosophizes amongst his cups and licks his chops at the prospect of cakes, he is soothed by Psalm-singing, with the result that he only deigns to listen to songs about David and Jeduthun, Asaph and the sons of Core during banquets. I have poured these things out more from grief than amusement; I cannot contain myself and I cannot turn a deaf ear to any abuse against apostles and martyrs.

inter phialas: Jerome closed his introduction with an image of Vigilantius at the table, calling to mind the picture just drawn of Jovinian among his pheasants (*inter Phasides...*).

placentas: Vigilantius was not, however, only a connoisseur of drink; he was also depicted licking his lips for cakes. These specific cakes Jerome has elsewhere mentioned as the type of food that children with no self-control hunger after in *Ep.* 128.1: *quid enim horteris ad continentiam, quae placentas desiderat, quae in sinu matris garrula uoce balbutit, cui dulciora sunt mella quam uerba?* Women also prepared these cakes for the Queen of Heaven instead of devoting themselves to God, for which they were punished (*Jer.* 7:18, 44:19).

ligurriens: This verb was used mainly and appropriately in comic and obscene contexts: *Aus. Epig.* 87.1, *Hor. Sat.* 2.4.78, 1.3.80; *Plaut. Capt.* 80; *Ter. Eun.* 934.

Finally, Vigilantius was charged with listening to the Psalms *only* during feasts, not in church where it was most appropriate. For comparison, in Augustine's *de Ord.* 1.8.23, Licentius was rebuked by Monica for singing Psalms in the bathroom. The alliteration coincides with meaning here: *psalmorum modulatione mulcetur*. Perhaps Jerome alluded to the fact that animals were commonly the ones "delighted" or "softened" by listening to music: *Ov. F.* 4.1.11: *harundineo carmine mulcet oues*; *Ambr. Exp. in Ps.* 1.2.2: *ferae ipsae atque aues loci amoenioris aut modulationis uocis delectatione mulcentur*.

psalmorum: The musicians listed are nearly synonymous with the Psalms themselves. David was a well-known musician (1 Sam. 16:14-23) and composed most of the Psalms. Jeduthun was a Temple singer and the only individual with Psalms written specifically for him as an accompanist: Ps. 39, 62, and 77. Asaph was a choir director and one of David's musicians (1 Chr. 6:39; 15:17; 16:5-7). Ps. 77 is attributed to him. Lastly, the sons of Korah are Assir,

Elkanah, and Abiasaph (Ex. 6:24) and the phrase usually refers to the titles of Psalms 42-49, 84-5, 87-8.

The first chapter overall is a sweeping display of Jerome's rhetoric and polemic. He mixed genres and registers, seamlessly wove both Christian and Classical learning, and ultimately left his readers with the strong impression that, if Vigilantius were in fact a monster, Jerome would be the only man capable of destroying him.

Chapter II

In this section, Jerome painted a caricature of Vigilantius as brutish and sex-crazed, much more like a horse than a civilized human being. He fleshed out the idea that Vigilantius closely resembled the centaurs listed in the previous section.

2.1 *Pro nefas episcopos sui dicitur sceleris habere consortes, si tamen episcopi nominandi sunt qui non ordinant diaconos, nisi prius uxores duxerint, nulli caelibum credentes pudicitiam, immo ostendentes quam sancte uiuant, qui male de omnibus suspicantur, et nisi praegnantem uxores uiderint clericorum infantesque in ulnis matrum uagientes, Christi sacramenta non tribuunt.*

Shocking! He is said to have bishops as his allies in wickedness. Bishops, if they should even be called bishops, who do not ordain deacons before they have married; they do not believe that any celibate person is actually chaste. Instead, they prefer to demonstrate in what a holy way they live by suspecting everyone else of evil-doing; and unless they see clergymen with pregnant wives as well as with infants howling in their mothers' arms, will not grant them the sacraments of Christ.

pro nefas: Vigilantius seduced others to believe as he did. His popularity made him dangerous and was one of the main reasons why Jerome needed to attack him. The horror of the situation in Gaul was bemoaned with an exclamatory "*pro nefas*." Jerome used the interjection similarly in *AJ* 2.37, finding it shameful that some men tried to find passages in Scripture to support their incontinence. Here, Vigilantius found not passages, but accomplices to support his lewd behavior.

episcopos...consortes: Accomplices in a criminal act were commonly called *socii criminis* (e.g. Ambros. *Quaes.* 127.11; Aug. *Ep.* 153.6; *CTh* 9.2.1) or *socii sceleris* (very frequent in Cicero, e.g. Cic. *De dom.* 49; *Cat.* 1.8, 3.3; *Phil.* 13.5; Aug. *De haer.* 1; Jer. *Comm. in Mal.* 3). *Consortes sceleris* was used infrequently and only twice elsewhere in Jerome, similarly indicating that a supporter of a crime was as complicit as the perpetrator. In his *Comm. in Matt.* 2, Jerome explained the circumstances in which Herod decided to behead John the Baptist. Herod might not have wanted to, but because of the expectations of people around him, chose to

do so: *propter eos qui pariter discumbebant, uult omnes sceleris sui esse consortes*. In *Comm. in Ezech.* 8.25, Jerome wrote that the oracles against Ammon were symbolic of secular men in general: such men delight in others' downfalls, as it provides them with considerable company in their crime and punishment: *mali consolationem suorum scelerum putant, si plures habeant consortes criminum atque supplicii*. In each of these instances, the accomplices were passively involved, but this did not make them any less guilty according to Jerome. The terms *scelus* and *crimen* seemed to be used interchangeably in Jerome and appeared many times in his works. E.g. *Comm. in Mt. 2: non solum emendare nequiuerit prodicionis nefas, sed ad prius scelus etiam proprii homicidii crimen addiderit*.

The interlocking word order and chiasmic structure nicely shows how inseparable Jerome thought the bishops were from Vigilantius: *episcopos sui dicitur sceleris habere consortes*. Note the interesting use of the passive. Jerome was reluctant to give Vigilantius' popularity too much credence. It is not clear who these bishops might have been. In whichever parish Vigilantius was at the time, Jerome knew that the bishop supported him (*Ep.* 109.2). David Hunter argued that Exsuperius of Toulouse had, for a time, vacillated between Vigilantius' and Jerome's sides of the debates ("Vigilantius," 401-30). He is certainly correct in noting that Vigilantius' views were more popular than Jerome would have had his readers believe. Whoever these bishops were, Jerome made it clear that failure to condemn Vigilantius was tantamount to full complicity.

He cast further doubt on the legitimacy of these so-called church officials with an alternating series of relative clauses and negative conditionals (*qui non ordinant...nisi prius uxores...qui male de omnibus suspicantur...nisi praegnantes uxores*). The reader is responsible for understanding the logical conclusion to whether these men can be called bishops. On the use of the term bishop in the early church, see Mohrmann, C. 1977. *Études sur le latin des Chrétiens*.

4 vols. Rome: Edizione d'Istoria e Letteratura. If they refuse to ordain deacons until their clergy have actively performed their marital duties, surely they are not proper bishops.

non ordinant diaconos: See Heid, S. 2000. *Celibacy in the Early Church: The Beginnings of a Discipline of Obligatory Continence for Clerics in East and West*. San Francisco: Ignatius. He argued that because Jerome only mentioned the ordination of deacons and other clergy, Vigilantius must not have spoken against the continence of priests or bishops (272). This argument from silence errs in accepting Jerome's polemic as fact. The focus of Jerome's attack was the credibility of these bishops: they, like the man they supported, were capable of something as extreme as denying the sacrament to men of the church who did not have pregnant wives. See note below on *sacramenta*. There is no evidence outside of Jerome's invective to suggest that these bishops actually denied sacraments to any of their clergy.

suspiciantur: What is more, these bishops were hypocrites, searching for others' sins in order to show themselves more innocent. Jerome mentioned a similar tactic in *Ep.* 45.4 and *In Mich.* 1.2. See also Hunter, D. 2009. "The Significance of Ambrosiaster." *J ECS* 17 (1): 1-26. In this article, Hunter used *Ep.* 45 as evidence that Jerome knew of Ambrosiaster's work and had responded to it in this letter. Because Jerome's own views on marriage, especially in response to Jovinian, were controversial (see *Ep.* 50.5), he carefully avoided raising the issue of whether celibacy is better than marriage. Instead, it was a question of episcopal power to control others' continence.

clericorum: This was the general term for "clergyman" (*TLL* s.v. 1339.48ff.) starting as early as the third century, used variously in Cyprian's letters, for example.

infantes...uagientes: Jerome has great difficulty mentioning babies without adding the fact that they howl, e.g. *AJ* 1.12; 1.36; *Epp.* 22.19; 49.18; 50.5; *CJ* 32; *Comm. in Ier.* 5.52.2; 5.61.5; 6.22.7; *Adv. Helv.* 20.

sacramenta: In Jerome, the sacraments often cover the range of duties a bishop oversees or performs, like baptism (*Comm. in Matt.* 4: *baptismi recipiat sacramentum*), but they may also mean the “mysteries” or “secrets” related to the church: e.g. *Comm. in Is.* 6.13.2: *quorum alterum significat abscondita ecclesiae sacramenta*; *Comm. in Ez.* 11.34: *incredibilia ecclesiae sacramenta panduntur*. In this context, they refer to the liturgical practices of ordaining clergy. For a general discussion of the term and its range in meaning, see Mohrmann, C. 1954.

“Sacramentum dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens.” *HThR* 47: 141-52.

2.2-3 *Quid facient orientis ecclesiae? Quid Aegypti et sedis apostolicae, quae aut uirgines clericos accipit aut continentes, aut, si uxores habuerint, mariti esse desistunt?*

What will the Churches of the East do? What about the churches of Egypt or the Apostolic See which only accept men who are either virgins or continent, or, if they have had wives, are no longer married?

Here, Jerome asks rhetorically what the rest of the Christian community will do with anaphora: *quid...? quid...?* In the churches of the east and elsewhere, celibacy had already been adopted. For example, Epiphanius wrote in support of clerical celibacy (*Exp. de fide* 21), as did John Chrysostom (*De virg.* 4). The west had already seen discussion of celibacy from the time of the Council of Elvira. Canon 33 maintained that anyone who entered the church as celibate must remain so. From Rome, Pope Innocent I wrote a letter to Victricius of Rouen in 404 (*Ep.* 2) and another to Exuperius of Toulouse in 405 (*Ep.* 6), both speaking to the necessity of clerical celibacy. It is clear that for these Gallic bishops, the issue of marriage for the clergy had not yet been settled. Innocent wrote that the most important tenet for members of the clergy was continence. For more on celibacy, see Elm, S. 1994. *Virgins of God: The Making of Asceticism*

in *Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Gryson, R. 1970. *Les origines du célibat ecclésiastique: du premier au septième siècle*. Gembloux: J. Duculot. By mentioning the East, Egypt, and Rome, Jerome emphasized once again that only in Gaul could a man with such teachings gain support (cf. CV 1.5; 4.4).

2.4 *Hoc docuit Dormitantius, libidini frena permittens et naturalem carnis ardorem, qui in adulescentia plerumque feruescit, suis hortatibus duplicans, immo extinguens coitu feminarum, ut <non sit> quo distemus a porcis, quo differamus a brutis animantibus, quo ab equis, de quibus scriptum est: "Equi insanientes in feminas facti sunt mihi: unusquisque in uxorem proximi sui hinniebat."*

This was Dormitantius' doctrine. He let the bridles on his lust slacken and through his encouragement doubled the natural burning of the flesh that frequently begins to flame during adolescence; or, rather, he puts it out by having sex with women so that we are in no way different from pigs, no way dissimilar to wild beasts, or to horses about which it is written: "*They became, in my opinion, like crazed horses chasing after women: each one was neighing for the wife of his neighbor.*"

hoc: The word order looks ahead to the parallel construction in 2.5. *hoc docuit Dormitantius...hoc est quod loquitur Daud*, and that is where the similarity ends.

libidini frena permittens: According to Jerome, Vigilantius would have wanted all the churches of the empire to follow his practices in Gaul. Jerome elaborated on his lascivious behavior by combining the commonplace metaphor of loosening reins with the real reputation of horses as exceptionally libidinous animals. The metaphor of loosening reins on desires occurs elsewhere in Jerome, occurring five other times in his texts (*AJ* 1.7; *Ad Titum*; *In Zach.* 3.14; *Ep.* 77.3; 79.9). Interesting is its relative rareness in Ambrose and its relative frequency of it in Augustine. Ambrose uses the metaphor in his *Exp. in Ps.* 22.3. Augustine uses it no fewer than 34 times in his works. This is perhaps due to his ambivalence towards women and his need to suppress any desires that might hinder his religious purpose. See Hunter, D. 2000. "The Virgin, the Bride, and the Church: Reading Psalm 45 in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine." *CH* 69 (2): 281-303, esp. 296ff. He argued that Augustine, as opposed to Ambrose and Jerome, interpreted

the virgin bride of Christ in Psalm 45 as the church, as he could not imagine a “mere woman” was actually meant. See Clark, E. 1989. "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism: Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 5 (2): 25-46. She explores the reason behind Augustine’s unusual lack of women correspondents, especially compared with Jerome and John Chrysostom. See also Asiedu, F. B. A. 2001. "The Song of Songs and the Ascent of the Soul: Ambrose, Augustine, and the Language of Mysticism." *VigChr* 55 (3): 299-317. Asiedu showed that, in spite of Ambrose’s influence on his career, Augustine especially avoided using much of the erotic imagery that Ambrose adapted from the Song of Songs, and made no mention at all of passages describing feminine charms. Thus, in his writing, Augustine answered the whispers of his old loves (*CD* 8.11.26) by repeatedly writing about suppressing desires.

naturalem carnis ardorem: Jerome used this phrase in *Ad Ephes.* 3, defending himself against accusations, claiming that he tried to protect chastity. In *Ep.* 125.7, Jerome wrote to Rusticus, a young monk, and counseled him on how to live as a virtuous monastic. Referring specifically to the natural ardor of the flesh is unique to Jerome and shows his sympathy. Augustine, however, wrote similarly in *C. Iul.* 4: *naturalem ardorem sexibus*. Continence was supposed to be difficult, especially during one’s adolescence, and Jerome did not pretend otherwise. Vigilantius, considering his background in bartending, would know how to make the perfect cocktail: *Jer. Ep.* 22.8: *uinum et adulescentia duplex incendium uoluptatis*; *Ambr. De uirg.* 3.2.5: *incendunt enim pariter duo, uinum et adulescentia*; *Greg. Naz. Or.* 15.12.

coitu feminarum: This phrase occurs in early in scientific writing and more generally in later Latin (e.g. *Cels. De Med.* 2.1, 4.31; *Plin. NH* pass.).

ut...quo: There is a textual problem between *ut* and *quo*. Feiertag shows that this part of the text in the majority of the manuscripts is illegible, thus he leaves it as blank (2005a, 8). However, previous editors have offered *ut non sit* as a conjecture, which at least completes the overall meaning of the passage satisfactorily.

porcis: Jerome referred to pigs' habits in his *Comm. in Os.* 2.7: *siue quia daemonum cultum sequitur libido et luxuria, qui colebant daemones, consequenter instar porcorum in caeno libidinum uersabantur*. Brute animals were similarly described in *Ep.* 64.21: *qui passim in morem brutorum animalium libidini expositi sunt*. Jerome also called the babbling of his opponents "grunnitus:" *AJ* 2.36; *Comm. in Ez.* 10.33; *Comm. in Is.* 12, praef.; *Comm. in Am.* 2.5; *Ep.* 50.5, 119.11, 125.18; *Comm. in Hier.* pass. Cf. *Phaed. Fab.* 5.5, where a buffoon is a more convincing pig than a pig. The passage in *AJ* 2.36 is relevant in another way, as Jerome called Jovinian a pig for his luxurious lifestyle. He and his followers were fat and fancily-coiffed; Jerome and his friends were "*tristes, pallidi, sordidati, et quasi peregrini huius saeculi*." As Jovinian-incarnate, Vigilantius and his friends must have been equally porcine in appearance and behavior. Cf. *Adu. Ruf.* 1.17, where Jerome wrote that the *Testamentum Porcelli* was a favorite school-text.

Equi...hinniebat: He concluded this list of animals with a few biblical quotations about horses. The first is from Jer. 5.8. Here is the *Vulgata* text of Jer. 5.8: *equi amatores et admissarii facti sunt unusquisque ad uxorem proximi sui hinniebat*. Jerome was the only one to rework the Jeremiah passage in this particular way. He used this phrasing often: e.g. *Adv. Helv.* 8; *Comm. in Ezech.* 3.8; *Comm. in Zach.* 2.9. In his *Comm. in Jer.* 1.96, Jerome wrote that a horse "*tantam ostendit insaniam libidinis*," explaining his preference for describing the horses as "*insanientes*."

This description is especially appropriate since he was referring to enemies characterized as uncontrollably amorous. Cf. Col. *RR*. 6.27.3:

Maxime itaque curandum est praedicto tempore anni, ut tam feminis quam admissariis desiderantibus coeundi fiat potestas, quoniam id praecipue armentum si prohibeas, libidinis exstimulatur furiis, unde etiam ueneno inditum est nomen hippomanes, quod equinae cupidini similem mortalibus amorem accendit.

Thus, special care must be taken at the appointed time of year to give the opportunity for mating as much to mares as to their stallions, because, if you prevent a herd especially, it is stimulated by the fury of their lust; hence the term "horse-madness" is given to the poison which enflames in human beings a passion similar to the desire in horses.

2.5-6 *Hoc est quod loquitur per David Spiritus Sanctus*: “Nolite fieri sicut equus et mulus, quibus non est intellectus.” *Et rursum de Dormitatio ac sociis eius*: “In freno et camo maxillas eorum constringe qui non approximant ad te.”

This is what the Holy Spirit said through David: “*Do not become like a horse or a mule, who have no intellect.*” And again, concerning Dormitatio and his cohorts: “*With a bit and a bridle restrain the mouths of those who do not come to you.*”

nolite...intellectus: This is from Ps. 31:9, and Jerome closed this second section with the rest of Ps. 31:9 (*in freno...ad te*). These citations were issued in rapid succession, attacking Vigilantius' deplorable sexual behavior and his intellect, and lastly, going for the jugular, Jerome closed in on Vigilantius and his friends, saying that, like the animals they were, they needed to be kept on a short leash. That Jerome chose to deploy a Psalm of David's, whom Vigilantius would only listen to during meals, showcases with what skill he deployed his acerbic wit. Vigilantius will certainly not be “*modulatione mulcetur*” (CV 1) of this Psalm. See note on this phrase in CV 1.11. Jerome ended as he began, expanding the danger of Vigilantius to those who also support him (*episcopos...consortes* and *de Dormitatio ac sociis eius*).

Chapter III

In this section, Jerome moved beyond the flourish of his introduction and told his readers how he came to write the *CV* and how he would proceed. Jerome used this section to defend the historicity of the events in the text and to ensure readers that he had not intended to write the treatise, but only did so as a favor and because people were starting to follow Vigilantius, however wrongly they might choose to do so.

3.1-2 *Sed iam tempus est ut ipsius uerba ponentes ad singula respondere nitamur. Fieri enim potest ut rursum malignus interpres dicat fictam a me materiam, cui rhetorica declamatione respondeam, sicut illam quam scripsi ad Gallias, matris et filiae inter se discordantium.*

But now it is time for me to lay out his words and respond point by point; for it is possible that a certain spiteful interpreter may say that I am fabricating this material so as to respond to it with a rhetorical exercise, just like the “letter” that I wrote to Gaul about the mother and daughter quarreling with one another.

sed iam tempus est: After the display of rhetoric in the previous sections, Jerome signaled that he was ready to write about the core of the problem in a concrete way. Jerome used the same construction and approach (*ad singula respondere*) in many other works (*Comm. in Is.* 16, praef.; *Ad Gal.* 3; *Comm. in Os.* prol.; *Comm. in Zach.* prol.; *Ep.* 78.1; *V. Hil.* 5), most similarly in *Ad Galat.* prol.: *sed iam tempus est, ut ipsius apostoli uerba ponentes, singula quaeque pandamus*. Although this practice seems to be common for Jerome, there is an added meaning to these words. Jerome was emphasizing the fact that he was responding to a genuine text in a systematic way.

fictam...materiam: Jerome anticipated any suspicions by mentioning *Ep.* 117, which he had written allegedly as a rhetorical exercise the previous year. In this passage, Jerome did not reveal for certain whether or not he did. His role is deliberately passive which suggests that he did not write the *CV* as a rhetorical exercise, burying his agency within the accusation of a potential *malignus interpres*. On the controversy over this letter, see Cain, A. 2009b. "Jerome's

Epistula 117 on the *Subintroductae*: Satire, Apology, and Ascetic Propaganda in Gaul."

Augustinianum 49: 119-143; Lössl, J. 1998. "Satire, Fiction, and Reference to Reality in Jerome's *Epistula* 117." *VigChr* 52: 172-192. Fictitious letters were not uncommon, and similar exercises appeared in different forms. For instance, Ovid wrote literary epistles, the *Heroides*, Petrarch wrote a letter to Cicero (*Epp. ad Fam.* 24.3). The reader of this treatise, however, unless he is a *malignus interpres*, should not understand the CV as a similar exercise. The phrase "*malignus interpres*" calls to mind the preface to Book 1 of Martial's *Epigrams*, where Martial is concerned that some may misinterpret the meaning of his work.

3.3-4 *Auctores sunt huius dictatiunculae meae presbyteri Riparius et Desiderius, qui parrochias suas uicina istius dicunt esse maculatas, miseruntque libros per fratrem Sisinnium, quos inter crapulam stertens euomit. Et adserunt repertos esse nonnullos, qui fauentes uitiiis suis, illius blasphemiiis adquiescunt.*

The holy presbyters, Riparius and Desiderius, who write that their parishes are tainted by mere proximity to the man, are the driving force behind this little piece of mine. Through brother Sisinnius they have even sent the works that [Vigilantius] managed to vomit up while snoring between hangovers, and they assert that there are not a few men who, in support of that man's sins, acquiesce in his blasphemies.

auctores: One of the suspect elements of *Ep.* 117 is the lack of names and specific details. For this reason, with *auctores* in emphatic placement, Jerome clarifies that the CV was written at the request of named individuals for a specific purpose. Riparius and Desiderius are the initiators.

dictatiuncula: This form occurs only here. *TLL* s.v. 999. Jerome minimized the scope of his work not necessarily because it was of lesser quality or shorter length, although it was a well-used *topos* in this work and throughout his corpus. It may also have been because he wished to minimize how much he was invested in dealing seriously with a comparatively insignificant presbyter.

Riparius: A presbyter from Gaul. Jerome had written to him previously about Vigilantius, at Riparius' request (*Ep.* 109). Three later letters (138, 151, and 152) were addressed to a Riparius, but Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, 245 argued convincingly for two Riparii, noting that Jerome wrote about Riparius' credentials in *Ep.* 138 as though unfamiliar with the man prior to writing - or less familiar than he ought to be with a man who would have helped him battle Vigilantius ten years earlier. No further information is available about him.

Desiderius: He might have been the recipient of the *Vita Martini: Seuere Desiderio fratri carissimo*. See Crouzel, H. 1972a. "Saint Jérôme et ses amis toulousains." *BLE* 73: 125-146. See also Desiderius 2 *PCBE* 2.1.551.

libros: The two presbyters sent books, some indication as to the relative size of Vigilantius' works. See Feiertag's discussion about the different words Jerome used to describe different sorts of writings (2005a, xx-xxv).

Sisinnium: Sisinnius, who had arrived from Gaul as an emissary of Exsuperius, bishop of Toulouse, delivered these books. Cf. *Ep.* 119.1, *Comm. in Zach.* prol. For the prosopography of the three men, see Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, 244-45 and 264.

libros...euomit: Cf. *AJ* 1.1: *secundi libri eius monstrabit exordium, quod hesternam crapulam ructans, ita euomit*; *Ep.* 69.2: *oscitabat tantum et quasi per mentis crapulam ructans et nausians euomebat*: 'apostolus dixit, paulus haec docuit.' Jerome's use of this phrase in *Ep.* 69, written in 397, was also in response to a man arguing with him about clerical celibacy.

fauentes uitiis suis, illius blasphemiis acquiescant: It was important for Jerome to reiterate that his response to Riparius and Desiderius was necessary because Vigilantius' influence was spreading. The chiasmic structure within the relative clause effectively juxtaposes the relationship between Vigilantius and his followers. Jerome used *uitiis fauere* to describe the

behavior of Jovinian's followers in AJ 2.36: *quod multi acquiescunt sententiae tuae, indicium uoluptatis est: non enim tam te loquentem probant, quam suis fauent uitiis*.

3.5 *Est quidem imperitus et uerbis et scientia, et sermone inconditus: nec uera quidem potest defendere, sed propter homines saeculi et mulierculas oneratas peccatis, semper discentes et numquam ad scientiam ueritatis peruenientes, una lucubratione illius neniis respondebo, ne sanctorum uirorum qui ut hoc facerem deprecati sunt, uidear litteras respuisse.*

He lacks skill in letters and knowledge; in speech he lacks culture. He cannot even defend what is true! Still, because of these secular men, these poor little women weighed down by their sins, all of them learning and never approaching actual knowledge of the truth - because of them, I will respond to that man's rubbish in a single night's vigil. I would not want to appear have rejected the letters of the holy men who asked me to do this.

imperitus...inconditus: Vigilantius was hardly a worthy opponent for Jerome. To demonstrate this, he employed contrast-imitation of Paul's admission in 2 Cor. 11:6: *etsi imperitus sermone, non tamen scientia*. Jerome sarcastically remarked on Vigilantius' style in Ep. 61.3: *scilicet gloriari cupis, ut in patria tua iactites me non potuisse respondere eloquentiae tuae et acumen in te Chrysippi formidasse*. For Jerome's views on others' style, see Hagendahl, H. 1958. *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*. Göteborg: Almqvist & Wiksell, esp. 311; see also Opelt, I. 1973. *Hieronymus' Streitschriften*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag, esp. 175, 178.

mulierculas...peruenientes: Even though Vigilantius lacked style and knowledge, he had an audience. See 2 Tim. 3:6: *ex his enim sunt qui penetrant domos et captiuas ducunt mulierculas oneratas peccatis quae ducuntur uariis desideriis*. The context of the passage in Timothy is especially appropriate here. The "*ex his*" from the text refers to people who are not unlike Vigilantius: blasphemers, proud, lovers of pleasure, etc. (2 Tim. 3:1 ff.), but they will not succeed: *insipientia enim eorum manifesta erit omnibus sicut et illorum fuit* (3:9). For Jerome's use of the term *mulierculae*, see Laurence, P. 1998. "L'implication des femmes dans l'hérésie: Le jugement de Saint Jérôme." *REA* 44: 241-267; Ferreiro, A. 1993. "Jerome's polemic against

Priscillian in his *Letter to Ctesiphon* (133, 4).” *REA* 39: 309-32. For a discussion of how Jerome uses the *topos* of feminine weakness in some of his work, see Clark, E. 1994. “Ideology, History, and the Construction of ‘Woman’ in Late Ancient Christianity.” *J ECS* 2 (2): 155-84. Jerome returned frequently to this passage: *Comm. in Ez.* 13.43; *Comm. in Is.* 16.57; *ibid.* 17.64; *Ep.* 22.28; *ibid.* 133.4; *In Hier.* 1 and 4. Vigilantius’ relationship with women becomes a joking matter again in *CV* 6. It is also interesting to compare *Ep.* 133.4: *Quid uolunt miserae mulierculae oneratae peccatis, quae circumferuntur omni uento doctrinae, semper discentes et nunquam ad scientiam ueritatis peruenientes*. In this letter, written in 415, Jerome made further connections between heretics such as Priscillian and Basilides and their popularity with women. See *CV* 6 for Vigilantius, Basilides, and possibly Priscillian.

lucubrationcula: To close this section, Jerome returned to the request of his brethren, still minimizing the importance of his opponent by stating how he would only spend one night working on a response. With the exception of *Aus. Ep.* 21 and *Gell. NA praef.* 14, this diminutive is wholly Jerome’s, and he often wrote of doing work in one, or a few nights: *Comm. in Abd.*, *Epp.* 34.6, 36.1, 64.22, 108.32, 117.12, 119.1, 143.2, 152, *prol. Jud.*, *prol. Tob.*

neniis: He will spend so little time because he considers Vigilantius’ work to consist of mere trifles. The word choice is appropriate. “*Neniae*,” typically meaning “dirges,” should be sung by women, which complements Jerome’s portrayal of Vigilantius’ bawdy lifestyle surrounded by women. For an in-depth study of the historical progression of “*neniae*” see Heller, J. 1943. *Nenia*. Diss. Lancaster Press; see also Habinek, T. 2005. *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 233-56. Habinek argued that “*neniae*” were seen as both magical and political and, what is especially relevant for the *Contra Vigilantium*, as a dirge, *neniae* are sung at funerals “for those

who believe that the dead cease to exist” (244). Cf. also 6.18: *inter mulierum textrina cantato*. Vigilantius is also “*modulatione mulcetur*” (1.11). Another meaning for the term is “lullaby,” which could also have worked well here, considering Vigilantius’ views on sleep. For this meaning, cf. Arn. *Adv. Nat.* 7.32: *lenes audiendae sunt neniae*. Jerome repeats this later in *Ep.* 143.2, after receiving a similar request to refute the works of a heretic named Annianus: *nec grande est ineptissimis **naeniis respondere**. si autem dominus uitam tribuerit et notariorum habuerimus copiam, **paucis lucubrationibus** respondebimus*. See 6.18 for more on *neniae* in Jerome.

uidear litteras respuisse: Jerome ends this chapter by stating once more that his hand has largely been guided by his obligation to Riparius and Desiderius. Similarly in *Ep.* 79.1, Jerome needed to write to Salvina partly because he could not refuse the request of another close relation named Avitus.

Chapter IV

Jerome opened with a standard invective *locus*: attacking the opponent's origins. In contrast to this, Levy discussed the *In Rufinum* and how Claudian conspicuously did not attack Rufinus' origins in Levy, H. L. 1946. "Claudian's *In Rufinum* and the Rhetorical ψόγος." *TAPA* 77: 57-65. For more on the invective *loci* of this treatise, see Appendix C. After establishing Vigilantius' background as a bandit, Jerome then for the first time cited his opponent verbatim.

4.1 *Nimirum respondeat generi suo, ut qui de latronum et conuenarum natus est semine, quos Cn Pompeius edomita Hispania et ad triumphum uenire festinans de Pyrenaei iugis deposuit et in unum oppidum congregauit, unde et Conuenarum urbs nomen accepit, hucusque latrocinetur contra ecclesiam dei, et de Vasconibus, Aruacis Celtiberisque descendens, incurset Galliarum ecclesias portetque nequaquam uexillum crucis, sed insigne diaboli.*

No surprise that he reflects his upbringing, being born from the stock of bandits and tramps (Pompey, after subduing Spain and being in a hurry to return for the triumph, brought them down from the Pyrenees and grouped them together in one town; this is how the city of Convenae got its name). After all, he still engages in banditry against the church of God, and, being a descendant of the Vectones, the Arrabaci, and the Celtiberians, he makes raids upon the churches of Gaul, not carrying the standard of the cross, but the banner of the devil.

latronum: Vigilantius' behavior was understandable given his exposure to robbers or bandits. These figures have a complex history throughout Roman antiquity; their existence, often in response to what was considered an unjust authority within the community, was commonly portrayed as a threat (Plin. *Ep.* 6.25; Dig. 49.15.24). Some groups, however, were seen as no different from dysfunctional polities (Aug. *CD* 4.4), and some were considered "noble" (Cass. Dio 77.10). *Latrones* also symbolized the devil, or demons (*TLL* s.v. 1016.71). Jerome tied Vigilantius specifically with the historical bandits subjugated by Pompey. In Plut. *Pomp.* 24 they were described as drunkards and participants in a strange religion:

αὐλοὶ δὲ καὶ ψαλμοὶ καὶ μέθαι παρὰ πᾶσαν ἀκτὴν

There were flutes, stringed instruments, and drinking parties along every coast (24.4)

ξένας δὲ θυσίας ἔθνον αὐτοὶ τὰς ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ, καὶ τελετάς τινας ἀπορρήτους ἐτέλουν

They offered strange sacrifices on Olympus and performed some secret rites (24.5)

See also the note on *centauros* in CV 1.1. Descent from a disreputable crew of refugee mountain people spoke against Vigilantius' character.

Conuenarum: Convenae was a community settled by Pompey at the foot of the Pyrenees, modern day St. Bertrand de Comminges. Plin. *NH* 4.19.33. For an archaeological and historical overview of the area, see Cleary, S.E. 2007. *Rome in the Pyrenees: Lugdunum and the Convenae from the First Century BC to the Seventh Century AD*. London: Routledge; Lizop, R. 1931. *Les Convenae et les Consoranni*. Vol. 25. Toulouse & Paris: Bibliotheque Meridionale, esp. 133-7, 349-50, 352.

latrocinetur: Jerome further characterized Vigilantius by using the verb *latrocinor*. Growing up in the same place as these bandits made Vigilantius an easy target for Jerome, but demonizing an enemy by tying him to bandits and criminals was a common topos in invective. For references on the use of *latrones* as a political insult, see Long, J. 1996. *Claudian's In Eutropium or How, When, and Why to Slander a Eunuch*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, p. 90, n. 61. For example, in responding to news of barbarian attacks throughout Italy, Gaul, and Spain, Augustine in *Ep.* 111.1 wondered if the depredations of heretics were not more devastating:

clericorum Donatistarum et Circumcellionum **latrocinia** sic uastant ecclesias, ut barbarorum fortasse facta mitiora sint.

The **villanies** of the Donatist clergy and Circumcelliones lay such waste to our churches, that perhaps the deeds of barbarians seem gentler by comparison.

incurset...diaboli: Jerome concluded this sentence by perverting the usual depiction of a holy man as a soldier of Christ (e.g. Martin of Tours) and making Vigilantius a bearer of the

“*insigne diaboli*.” This image anticipates Jerome’s depiction of Vigilantius later as one possessed by a demon (CV 5.10, 10.7ff.).

4.2-3 *Fecit hoc idem Pompeius etiam in orientis partibus, ut Cilicibus et Isauris piratis latronibusque superatis sui nominis inter Ciliciam et Isauriam conderet ciuitatem. Sed haec urbs hodie seruat scita maiorum et nullus in ea ortus est Dormitantius.*

Pompey himself did the very same thing in the East: after he overcame the Cilician and Isaurian pirates and brigands, he founded a city in his name right between Cilicia and Isauria. But that city to this day preserves the ordinances of its ancestors and no Dormitantius has been born there.

fecit ciuitatem: Jerome contrasted the danger Vigilantius posed to the people of Gaul with the success of Pompey’s campaign (in 66 BCE) in the East to combat piracy. See Plut. *Pomp.* 24 ff. The people of those lands learned from Pompey how to get rid of bandits.

scita: The word is apposite here, as it is most frequently used in conjunction with popular decrees, not legal ones (Liv. 31.50; Tac. *Ag.* 3.58; Plin. *NH* 14.22.28). As much as the lands in which Hercules once traveled became free of monsters, so, too, the Eastern lands conquered by Pompey. Only Gaul still awaited a similar hero to rid her of this enemy.

ortus est Dormitantius: cf. CV 1.6, note on *exortus*.

4.4 *Galliae uernaculum hostem sustinent et hominem moti capitis atque Hippocratis uinculis adligandum sedentem cernunt in ecclesia, et inter cetera uerba blasphemiae ista quoque dicentem: QUID NECESSE EST TANTO TE HONORE NON SOLUM HONORARE, SED ETIAM ADORARE ILLUD NESCIQ QUID QUOD IN MODICO VASCULO TRANSFERENDO COLIS?*

Gaul puts up with a homegrown enemy and sees sitting in its church a man whose head jiggles, deserving to be bound with Hippocratean chains, and between other blasphemous words he even says: “Why is it necessary not only that you honor with such great honor, but also that you worship that something or other which you revere while carrying it around in a little vessel?”

uernaculum: The adjective here can mean either “homegrown” or “common” (cf. Cic. *Fam.* 9.15.1 and Apul. *Apol.* 18), but here “homegrown” to continue Jerome’s description of

Vigilantius as Gaul's local monster (CV 1.5-6). Compare also the panegyrist who attacked Maxentius in 313, as a *monstrum*, *prodigio*, and *uernula purpuratus* (Pan. Lat. 12 [9].17.2).

moti capitis: A description of a mental malady, or a separation of the mind from the body. TLL s.v. *moueo* 1542.75. Cf. also CV 5.1, “*insanum caput*.”

Hippocratis uinculis: Vigilantius was dangerous and needed to be bound by the “chains of Hippocrates” (a straitjacket). Chains were used commonly to restrain those considered insane and a danger either to themselves or others. Celsus, for example, described this treatment in *De med.* 13.8. Both Dionysus and Hercules were bound (Eur. *Bac.* 432-50, 509-18 and *HF* 1035-38). Rebenich, *Jerome*, 194 cited Theod. *Affect.* 1.5 (SC 57, 105). Jerome also wanted to use these chains on Vigilantius in *Ep.* 109.2:

ego, ego uidi hoc aliquando portentum et testimoniis scripturarum quasi **uinculis Hippocratis** uolui ligare furiosum, sed abiit, excessit, euasit, erupit et inter Adriae fluctus Cottique regis Alpes in nos declamando clamauit.

I, for my part, I have seen this portent at some time and I wanted to bind this raging man with passages from Scripture just like the **chains of Hippocrates**, but “he departed, he withdrew, he escaped, he broke out” and between the waves of the Adriatic and the Alps of King Cottius, he shouted out, declaiming against us.

Jovinian aroused the same feelings in Jerome (*AJ* 1.3): *nonne uel per febrem somniare eum putes, uel arreptum morbo phrenetico, Hippocratis uinculis alligandum?*

honorare...adorare: See Ch. 3, p.49, for an analysis of this *distinctio*. Note the pleonasm *honore...honorare*, which supports Vigilantius' point about how excessively people worshiped relics.

uasculo: An apt word for “container.” *Vasculum* is used metaphorically for the body in Christian Latin, e.g. Arn. *In Ps.* 70; Jer. *Ad Tit.*; Hil. Pict. *Comm. in Mt.* 27.4. The metaphor goes back to the New Testament *uas*: Rm. 9:21, 1 Thess. 4:4, 2 Tim. 2:21, etc.

transferendo: See Ch. 3, pp. 43-45 also for the background on relics and their translation.

The use of the gerund as a substitute for the present active participle is a feature of Late Latin and is common from the fourth century onward. *LHS* 2.380.

4.5-6 *Et rursum in eodem libro: QUID PULVEREM LINTEAMINE CIRCUMDATUM ADORANDO OSCULARIS? Et in consequentibus: PROPE RITUM GENTILIUM VIDEMUS SUB PRAETEXTU RELIGIONIS INTRODUCTUM IN ECCLESIIIS: SOLE ADHUC FULGENTE MOLES CEREORUM ACCENDI, UT UBICUMQUE PULVISCVLUM NESICIO QUOD IN MODICO VASCULO PRETIOSO LINTEAMINE CIRCUMDATUM OSCULANTES ADORENT.*

And again in the same work: “Why do you kiss and worship dust wrapped in linen?” In the following: “We see that a practically pagan rite has been brought into the church under the pretext of piety, that although the sun is still shining, mounds of wax are being lit, so that people everywhere may worship and kiss some small quantity of dust or suchlike in a little vessel, nestled in expensive linen cloth.”

oscularis: For a readable overview and analysis of the ritual aspect of the kiss, see Penn, M.P. 2005. *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Kissing relics seems to have put the one who kissing in touch with the person to whom the relic belonged. For instance, *Ep.* 108.9: *ingressa sepulchrum resurrectionis osculabatur lapidem, quem ab ostio sepulchri amouerat angelus, et ipsum corporis locum, in quo dominus iacuerat, quasi sitiens desideratas aquas fide, ore lambebat*; see also *Prud. Peri.* 2.517-21, 5.337-40, 9.99-100; *Aug, Serm.* 277A. Compare Vigilantius’ neutral verb for kiss, “*osculari*” with Jerome’s descriptive and more graphically repulsive “*lambere*.”

prope ritum gentilium: *Gentiles* was one of the terms meaning “pagan.” See Opelt, I. 1965. *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag, esp. 1-22. (*TLL* s.v. 1869).

sub praetextu religionis: This phrase is found mostly in later Latin, originating in legal texts (e.g. *CTh* 1.5.4, 4.4.5, etc.).

moles cereorum accendi: Here, Vigilantius briefly touched on one of his major complaints. Christian devotion has become idolotrous and the use of candles seemed particularly illegitimate to him. “*Moles cereorum accendi*” is clearly hyperbolic; Vigilantius, too, was writing polemic. His overall criticism was valid and attested in other sources. See Ch. 3, pp. 52-55. It is possible that Vigilantius remained conservative in reaction to people like Paulinus of Nola who were extremely enthusiastic about adopting the practice. See CV 7-8 for Jerome’s response about candles.

pretioso linteamine: Cf. *Ep.* 64.20 to Fabiola, written 396/7: *Praeceptis Dei lauandi sumus, et cum parati ad indumentum Christi, tunicas pelliceas deposuerimus, tunc induemur ueste linea, nihil in sese mortis habente, sed tota candida*. In describing the linen as rather expensive, Vigilantius highlights the comparative insignificance and uncleanness of what is being wrapped.

UT: See Feiertag (2005a, 33 n.8). As it stands, the text is readable, although the “ut” is daggered in his text.

puluisculum nescio quod...osculantes: Wrapping relics in expensive cloth and the obvious polemic against the exiguous size of the relics call to mind what Jerome wrote of Paul’s burial in the *Vita Pauli* 17:

Paulus uilissimo puluere coopertus iacet resurrecturus in gloriam: uos operosa saxis sepulcra premunt cum uestris opibus arsueros. Parcite, quaeso, uos: parcite saltem diuitiis quas amatis. Cur et mortuos uestros auratis obuoluitis uestibus? Cur ambitio inter luctus lacrimasque non cessat? An cadauera diuitum nisi in serico putrescere nesciunt?

Paul lies covered with worthless dust, but will rise again to glory; over you are raised costly tombs, but both you and your wealth are doomed to burn. Have a care, I pray you, at least have a care for the riches you love. Why are even the grave-clothes of your dead made of gold? Why does not your vaunting cease even amid mourning and tears? Cannot the carcasses of rich men decay except in silk? (trans. Fremantle [adapted])

Jerome distinguishes between the remains of a saint and those of a rich man, and perhaps Jerome thinks Vigilantius lacks this ability. See CV 8-10 for the repeated phrase “*pulvis uilissimus*.”

The diminutive is also evidence of Vigilantius’ participation in the debate on relic veneration. First, Vigilantius clearly emphasized his disdain for relic worship. But perhaps, as David Hunter has argued (“Vigilantius,” 401-30), he was also responding to how some were justifying and practicing the veneration of relics, contemporaries such as Victricius of Rouen and Paulinus of Nola. Further evidence may be added to his conclusion by comparing Vigilantius’ words with some of the rhetoric found in both contemporaries. See note on CV 4.6.

In his sermon, *De laude sanctorum* 10, Victricius defended the healing and intercessory powers of relics:

Cernimus **paruas reliquias, nonnihil sanguinis**. Sed **has minutias** clariores esse quam sol est, ueritas intuetur, Domino in euangelio dicente: Sancti mei fulgebunt sicut sol in regno Patris.

We see these **small remains, some blood**. But the truth regards **these little particles** as brighter than the sun, with the Lord saying in the Gospel, “My saints will shine like the sun in the kingdom of the Father.”

Here, Victricius promoted the notion that something so small, seemingly so insignificant contained within it the limitless power of God.

In addition to Victricius, several years later, circa 403/404, Paulinus spoke of relics in a similar way in his *Carmen* 19.359 ff.:

... quaque osse minuto
de modica sacri stipe corporis **exiguus ros**
decidit in gentes, illic pia gratia fontes
et fluuios uitae generauit **gutta fauillae**.
inde in nos etiam stillauit copia Christi
diues et in minimis; nam hoc quoque sumpsimus istic,
carnis apostolicae sacra pignora **puluere paruo**

Wherever a **tiny drop of dew** has fallen on men in the shape of a fragment of bone, the small offering of a consecrated body, holy grace has brought forth fountains in that place,

and the **drops of ashes** have brought forth rivers of life. From this, the abundance of Christ, rich even in its smallest forms, has dripped upon us as well; for we, too, have received in **a bit of dust** the sacred pledges of the apostles' flesh...

Note how Paulinus emphasized the power of relics, contrasting their exiguous size with their great power. Although it is not known when Vigilantius began to preach against relics, he had definitely begun to do so before 404 (Jer. *Ep.* 109.1). Because of his previous connection with Paulinus, Vigilantius was probably aware of his and other writers' paradoxical way of championing relics. For the "inverted magnitude" of relics, see Brown, P. 1981. *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 78-79. It is not improbable that Vigilantius knew of Victricius as well, for Victricius was certainly known to Paulinus and Sulpicius Severus at the time when Vigilantius was still in their circle. See Paul. *Ep.* 18, *Ep.* 37; Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* 3.2. Ultimately, Vigilantius' dismissal of relics as "a little bit of dust" also affected Paulinus and perhaps Victricius, too.

4.7 MAGNUM HONOREM PRAEBENT HUIUSMODI HOMINES BEATISSIMIS MARTYRIBUS, QUOS PUTANT DE VILISSIMIS CEREOLIS ILLUSTRANDOS, QUOS AGNUS, QUI EST IN MEDIO THRONI CUM OMNI FULGORE MAIESTATIS SUAE ILLUSTRAT.

"Men of this kind confer a great honor upon the most blessed martyrs, thinking that they should be given splendor from the cheapest of candles, men to whom the Lamb, who is in the middle throne with all the brilliance of his majesty, gives splendor."

beatissimis...uilissimis: Vigilantius used the superlatives to good effect, contrasting the cheap light of candles with the unmatched glory of the martyrs.

de...illustrandos: For *de* + abl. to denote instrumentality, see *TLL* s.v. 63.65.

qui est in medio throni: Apoc. 7:17: *quoniam agnus qui in medio throni est reget illos et deducet eos ad uitae fontes aquarum et absterget Deus omnem lacrimam ex oculis eorum*. This passage, drawn partly from Is. 49:10, describes the happy fates of those who have faith in God during the apocalypse. Jerome did not quote this passage elsewhere, nor did contemporary

church fathers. For Jerome's attitude towards the apocalypse and millenarianism, see O'Connell, *Eschatology*, 1948. Vigilantius might have included in this part of his text 2 Sam. 22:29; Ps. 97:11, 112:4; Is. 60:19; Jn 12:46, etc., to support his belief that the blessed are in the eternal light provided by God. See CV 6.14, the note on Esdras, for Vigilantius' use of another apocalyptic text.

quos...illustrandos...quos...illustrat: The parallel construction demonstrates Vigilantius' style. The few direct quotations of his writing show Vigilantius cared about what he wrote and how. See Ch. 1, pp. 13-15.

Chapter V

Jerome defended his position that those who venerated relics did not *worship* them and added that the bones belonged not to the dead, but to the sleeping.

5.1-3 *Quis enim, o insanum caput, aliquando martyres adorauit? Quis hominem putauit deum? Nonne Paulus et Barnabas cum a Lycaonibus Iuppiter et Mercurius putarentur et eis uellent hostias immolare sciderunt uestimenta sua et se homines esse dixerunt, non quod meliores non essent olim mortuis hominibus Ioue atque Mercurio, sed quod sub gentilitatis errore honor eis deo debitus deferretur?*

Who, you insane man, has ever worshipped martyrs? Who considered a human being to be God? Was it not the case that Paul and Barnabas, when the people of Lycaonia thought they were Jupiter and Mercury and wanted to prepare sacrifices for them, tore their garments and declared that they were human beings? Not because they were not better than Jupiter and Mercury, who were once dead men, but because, according to the mistaken beliefs of the gentiles, honor was being given to them when it was owed to God.

Quis...putauit: The rhetorical question is a common tool of polemicists to provide a reductive paraphrase of their opponent's theses, rendering them ridiculous. E.g. Aug. *Contra Iul.*

4.1.4: *Quis autem nostrum suspicatus est usum coniugum a diabolo fuisse repertum? Quis commixtionem corporum per malum praeuuaricationis credidit accidisse; cum sine his nuptiae prorsus esse non possent?*

o insanum caput: Jerome dusted off an old chestnut. In his *Ep.* 109 written to Riparius about Vigilantius in 404, Jerome wrote: *in auctoris caput et insanum cerebrum* (109.1) and *insanum curandum caput* (109.2). For the insulting tenor of an otherwise ambivalent adjective, see Opelt, *Schimpfwörter*. The exclamation is an echo of Lact. *Inst.* 5.3.8: *Cur igitur, o delirum caput, nemo Apollonium pro Deo colit?*

Paulus et Barnabas: Acts 14:8ff. Paul was addressed as Hermes and Barnabas as Zeus because Paul had healed a lame man. See Ov. *Met.* 8.611-724, for the myth where Zeus and Hermes visited the region in human form. For the coincidence, see Gill, D.W.J. and B.W. Winter. 1994. "Acts and Roman Religion," in Gill, D.W.J. and C. Gempf, eds. *The Book of Acts*

in Its First Century Setting: Graeco-Roman Setting. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, pp. 79-102. In 396, Augustine had likewise used this passage to support his claim that martyrs and holy men were not worshiped as gods (*Serm.* 273.8).

sciderunt uestimenta sua: Rending one's garments can be a response to blasphemy (Mark 14:63), a gesture of mourning (1 Macc. 4:39), and a show of repentance (Ezra 9:3-5).

olim mortuis hominibus: Euhemerus, from the 4th/5th century BCE, is credited as the first ancient author to speculate that the gods of mythology were humans deified after death. His work was translated into Latin by Ennius, whose fragments are preserved in Lactantius (*De ira* 2.7.8). For more discussions related to Euhemerism, see, for example Lact. *Inst.* 1.6; *ibid.* 1.11-15; Tert. *Idol.* 9.3; Clem. *Protrep.* 2.24.2; Min. Fel. *Oct.* 21.1; Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 4.29. Christian apologists often used Euhemeristic theory to support their arguments that, because the mythological gods were mortals, those who worshiped them were idolatrous. Augustine also blamed earlier pagan authors for continuing to conceal this fact (e.g. *CD* 6.10). The success of Euhemerism among Christian authors was in part due to similar ideas expressed in the Wisdom of Solomon 14.15-20. For Euhemerism in Ennius, see Skutsch, F. 1905. "Ennius." *RE* 5: 2589-2628.

deo debitus deferretur: Note the alliteration and *crescendo*, capturing Jerome's indignation.

5.4-7 *Quod et de Petro legimus, qui Cornelium se adorare cupientem manu subleuauit et dixit: Surge nam et ego homo sum. Et audes dicere: ILLUD NESICIO QUID QUOD IN MODICO VASCULO TRANSFERENDO COLIS. Quid est ILLUD NESICIO QUID? scire desidero! Expone manifestius, ut tota libertate blasphemēs, PULVISCULUM, inquis, IN MODICO VASCULO PRETIOSO LINTEAMINE CIRCUMDATUM.*

And we also read that Peter, when Cornelius wanted to worship him, raised him and said, "*Stand up, for I, too, am a man.*" And are you so brazen as to say, "that something or other that you worship by carrying it around in a little vessel"? I really want to know! What is this "something or other?" Explain more clearly, so that you can blaspheme with complete freedom, what you mean by "some speck of dust or other in a little vessel, nestled in expensive linen cloth."

surge...homo: Acts 10:26. Apostles are to be treated as men, no more. See also Apoc. 19:10 and Wis. 7:1.

tota libertate: Jerome meant *parrhesia*. Vigilantius was challenged to be as plain in his blasphemy as possible, to take full responsibility for the heretical words he preached. In general, Jerome used this phrase to mean something like “truthfully” or “without guile,” e.g. *Ep.* 97.2: *En Papa Theophilus tota Origenem arguit libertate haereticum esse*; *Ep.* 112.17: *Neque imitari Petrum uoluerit mentientem, ut quod erat, metu Iudaeorum dissimularet: sed tota libertate Iudaeum esse se diceret*. Cf. also 120.9. Jerome wrote similarly of other sinners who acted “*tota libertate*,” e.g. *Comm. in Ez.* 5.16; *Comm. in Is.* 16.57.9.

5.8-9 *Dolet martyrum reliquias pretioso operiri uelamine et non uel pannis et cilicio colligari uel proici in sterquilinum ut solus Vigilantius ebrius et dormiens adoretur. Ergo sacrilegi sumus, quando apostolorum basilicas ingredimur?*

He is upset that martyrs’ remains are covered in costly linen instead of being tied up with rags or hair shirts or cast onto a heap of manure; thus, only Vigilantius, drunk and drowsy, may be worshiped. Does it follow, then, that we are sacrilegious when we enter the basilicas of the Apostles?

uelamine: Note the *uariatio*.

uel pannis...sterquilinum: *Panni* and *cilicia* were typically worn by ascetic Christians to demonstrate their devotion to God and not to worldly luxuries such as expensive fabrics. Jerome praised those who chose the former, e.g. *Ep.* 108.22. See also Aug. *Serm.* 62.8 for the argument that God prefers those in rags, “*misertus est, ut ornaret; ornauit, ut amaret*.” The implication is that Vigilantius, who did not wear uncomfortable fabrics, was being hypocritical by allegedly believing that relics should be clothed no differently from the Christians who revered them. He may have been hypocritical, but Jerome still avoided addressing his criticism.

sterquilinum: Jerome was alluding to Jer. 8:1-2:

in tempore illo, ait Dominus, eicient ossa regis Iuda et ossa principum eius et ossa sacerdotum et ossa prophetarum et ossa eorum qui habitauerunt Hierusalem de sepulchris suis et pendent ea ad solem et lunam et omnem militiam caeli quae dilexerunt et quibus seruierunt et post quae ambulauerunt et quae quaesierunt et **adorauerunt** non colligentur et non sepelientur; **in sterquilinium** super faciem terrae erunt.

At that time, says the Lord, the bones of the kings of Judah, the bones of its officials, the bones of the priests, the bones of the prophets, and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem will be cast out of their tombs and they shall be spread before the sun and the moon and all the host of heaven, which they have loved and served, behind which they have walked, and which they have sought and **worshiped**; and they will not be gathered or buried; **they will be like dung** on the surface of the earth.

With this allusion, Jerome added depth to Vigilantius' error, making it seem as though

Vigilantius wanted to treat relics no differently from the bones of disrespected Jews.

ebrius et dormiens: I Thess. 5:7. Paul writes: *qui enim dormiunt nocte dormiunt et qui ebrii sunt nocte ebrii sunt*. Vigilantius did both.

basilicas: The word *ecclesia* appears throughout Jerome's works. He rarely used *basilica* and only for a specific building (e.g. *basilica beati Petri*, *Ep.* 22.32, *basilica Laterani*, *Ep.* 77.4). Of the twenty-two instances of *basilica* in his works, ten were in response to Vigilantius' arguments against worshiping martyrs, hence *basilicae martyrum* (*CV* 5.9, 8, 8, 9, 10, 10, 12; *Ep.* 109.1[2 times]). To this must be added Jerome's unmistakable reference to Vigilantius in his *Comm in Is.* 18.65.4. The verse of Isaiah is part of a diatribe against idolatrous people, specifically those "*qui habitant in sepulchris et in delubris idolorum dormiunt*." Jerome responded to criticism that keeping vigils and dwelling in *martyria* is similar to what was condemned in Isaiah. For commentary on this passage, see Jay, P. 1985. *L'Exégèse de Saint Jérôme: D'après son "Commentaire sur Isaïe"*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, p. 320. See also Saxer, *Morts*, 173-91 for information on African basilicas, and for the west, Grabar, *Martyrium*, 1.426ff. One may infer that Vigilantius found these basilicas dedicated to martyrs another example of excessive worship, perhaps owing to the recent erection of the basilica of St.

Saturninus in Toulouse. See Griffe, *Gaule*, 3.226-30 who suggested that the construction of the building might have influenced Vigilantius' views. See also Crouzel, "Ses amis," 135-38.

5.10 *Sacrilegus fuit Constantius imperator, qui sanctas reliquias Andreae, Lucae et Timothei transtulit Constantinopolim, apud quas daemones rugiunt et habitatores Vigilantii illorum se sentire praesentiam confitentur?*

Was Constantius the Emperor sacrilegious when he transferred the remains of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy to Constantinople? No, the demons roared and the inhabitants of Vigilantius confessed that they sensed their presence.

Constantius: Flavius Julius Constantius (*PLRE* 1.226, *RE* s.n. Constantius 4), was Augustus from 337-361. Although Ammianus was hostile to him (*Res Gestae* 14 passim), other contemporaries regarded him favorably, and his decision to translate relics and his architectural patronage were both extremely influential. For a discussion of the architectural aspects, see Kleinbauer, W.E. 2006. "Antioch, Jerusalem, and Rome: The Patronage of Emperor Constantius II and Architectural Invention." *Gesta* 45: 125-45.

reliquias: The translation took place sometime in the late 350s, but the dating is disputed; see Woods, D. 1991. "The Date of the Translation of the Relics of SS. Luke and Andrew to Constantinople," *VigChr* 45 (3): 286-292. Paulinus, in his *Carm.* 19.317-24, named Constantine as the emperor who translated the relics, but Jerome attributed the translation to Constantius II. Cf. *Chron. Pasch. s.a.* 356 and 357 (*CSHB* 542). For Jerome's use of historical exempla, see Rebenich, *Hieronymus*, 29-46.

daemones rugiunt: Jerome and only a few others described demons behaving this way; e.g. In *Ep.* 108.5, Paula saw demons in a church screaming; in *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 3.42, Jerome commented sarcastically about Rufinus being so holy that demons howled at his handkerchief. It is probable that Jerome had in mind 1 Peter 5:8: *sobrii estote uigilate quia aduersarius uester diabolus tamquam leo rugiens circuit quaerens quem deuoret*; in which case, Jerome added

another clever insult: Vigilantius could have avoided possession if he had not been a Dormitantius.

habitatores: *Habitator* was sometimes used to describe the soul in Aug. *Serm.* 63A; or Christ, e.g. Jer. *Adv. Helv.* 2; or the Holy Spirit, e.g. Greg. Magn. *Reg. ep.* 13.32. Both 4 Ezra 3:20-27 and 4 Maccabees 2:21-3:5 describe evil presences existing within each person, although a demon is not specifically named. Actual possession of an individual by demons or the devil was mentioned more frequently in the Gospels (e.g. Mt. 11:18; Mk 3:22; 9:17; Lk 4:33; 7:33). There was also a correlation between one's cleanliness and susceptibility to possession (e.g. Mt 10:1; Mk 3:10-12; Lk. 4:33-37). Cf. CV 1.6, where Jerome described Vigilantius as having an "*immundus spiritus*." Heretics were also described as being possessed or in need of exorcism (e.g. Iren. *Adv. Haer.* 5.26.2; Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* 5.16.6-19.4). See Aug. *De beat. uit.* 18 for a description of two distinct types of "unclean spirits." For demons and possession in early Christianity in general, see Sorensen, E. 2002. *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck. See also Brakke, D. 2006. *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 97-124 on Shenoute, a 4th/5th century Egyptian saint, relentlessly attacking heretics, pagans, etc. for being united with the devil.

5.11-12 *Sacrilegus dicendus est et nunc Augustus Arcadius, qui ossa beati Samuhelis longo post tempore de Iudaea transtulit Thraciam? Omnes episcopi non solum sacrilegi, sed et fatui iudicandi, qui rem uilissimam, cineres dissolutos, in serico et uase aurea portauerunt?*

Then, must Emperor Arcadius also now be called sacrilegious, since he, after a long time, transferred the bones of the blessed Samuel from Judaea to Thrace? Are all bishops, then, not only sacrilegious but also to be judged as silly because they have carried the cheapest substance, crumbled ashes, around in silk and inside a golden vase?

Arcadius: Flavius Arcadius Augustus was the eastern emperor from 395-408. For his life and activities as emperor, see Cameron, A., J. Long, and L. Sherry. 1993. *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

ossa beati Samuhelis: The translation of Samuel's bones is dated to 406 in the *Chronicon paschale* (CSHB 569ff.).

sacrilegi...fatui: Jerome trivialized Vigilantius' disapproval of translating relics by setting up the slightly different, fallacious proposition that Vigilantius considered these people to be foolish. Setting up straw men was easy and effective, but it did not address the genuine criticism behind Vigilantius' controversial opinions.

rem...dissolutos: Feiertag's text reads "rem uilissimam et cineres dissolutos" (2005a, 13) which makes less sense than to remove the "et" and make "cineres dissolutos" in apposition to "rem." Vigilantius is only criticizing the translation of one thing.

5.13-14 *Stulti omnium ecclesiarum populi, qui occurrerunt sanctis reliquiis et tanta laetitia quasi praesentem uiuentemque cernerent susceperunt, ut de Palaestina usque Calcedonem iungerentur populorum examina et in Christi laudes una uoce sonarent? Videlicet adorabant Samuhelem et non Christum, cuius Samuhel et leuita et propheta fuit.*

Are the people of all churches foolish, who went to visit holy relics and received them with as great a joy as if they were seeing a living being in the flesh so that crowds of people might be joined together from Palestine all the way to Chalcedon and resound in one voice in praise of Christ? It *must* have been the case that these people adored Samuel instead of Christ - Samuel who was Christ's Levite and prophet.

de Palaestina usque Calcedonem: This is a striking image. Following the examples cited, Jerome illustrated how widespread was the belief in Christ and in the power of those who gave their lives in order to worship him. How could Vigilantius possibly contend with all of the Holy Land?

Leuita: See 1 Sam and 2 Sam. Levites were an Israelite tribe of priests named after Levi, a son of Jacob. See, for example, Num. 18:2-6, Jer. 33:22-24.

5.15-18 *Mortuum suspicaris et idcirco blasphemus. Lege Euangelium: Deus Abraham, deus Isaac, deus Iacob. Non est deus mortuorum, sed uiuorum. Si ergo uiuunt, honesto, iuxta te, carcere non claudantur.*

You are suspicious of the dead, so you blaspheme. Read the Gospel: “*God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob. He is not God of the dead, but of the living.*” If they are alive, then, according to you, they should not be kept in an honorable confinement.

mortuum suspicaris: Jerome repeated the charge he made two years earlier in *Ep.* 109.1.

See Ch. 3, p.48. Cf. Leviticus 22 and Numbers 19 for potential pollution caused by corpses. For Christian and Jewish beliefs and practices toward the dead, see McCane, R. 1992. "Is a Corpse Contagious? Early Jewish and Christian Attitudes toward the Dead," *SBL* 31: 378-388.

Epiphanius of Salamis also wrote against the Samaritans' belief in the impurity of corpses (*Panarion* 3.6ff.).

Abraham...Isaac...Jacob: The patriarchs (Gen 21-37).

non deus mortuorum, sed uiuorum: Mt 22:32; Mk 12:27; Lk 20:38. For commentary on this, see Iren. *Adv. Haer.* 4.5.2; Orig. *Comm. in Ioh.* 2.10-11.

honesto...carcere: A prison is nowhere else described as “*honestus*” until the 15th century (e.g. Antonio Bonfini's *Rerum Ungaricarum Decades*). See below, however, in 6.2 for *honesta custodia*. This paraphrase concerns Vigilantius' views on where souls go when the body dies and effectively summarizes Jerome's problem related to this issue. The difference is that Jerome did not believe in a fixed *refrigerium interim* while Vigilantius did. For the changing beliefs from the third to fourth centuries concerning the location of souls after the resurrection of Christ, see Stuiber, A. 1957. *Refrigerium interim*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag. For Jerome's understanding of the chronology of the afterlife, see Shanzer, D. 2014. “One Dead Girl, Two Living Ladies, Quohélet, and the Judgment of Man: Eschatological Problems, Particular Judgment, and Jerome's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*” in Elisabeth Birnbaum and Ludger Schwienhorst-

Schönberger, eds. *Hieronymus als Exeget und Theologe. Interdisziplinäre Zugänge zum „Koheletkommentar“ des Hieronymus*, " Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium" forthcoming Peeters Leuven.

Chapter VI

There is a discussion about the intercessory power of martyrs and the texts Vigilantius used to support his side of the argument.

6.1 *Ais enim uel in sinu Abrahae uel in loco refrigerii uel subter aram dei animas apostolorum et martyrum consedissee nec posse suis tumulis et ubi uoluerint adesse praesentes.*

You say that the souls of the apostles and the martyrs have come to rest either in the lap of Abraham, or in a place of refreshment, or under the altar of god and that they are unable to leave their tombs and be present where they wish.

Ais: This is the first instance of Jerome using indirect statement to provide a short paraphrase of Vigilantius' beliefs concerning the afterlife. For an overview of Jerome's, see O'Connell, *Eschatology*.

in sinu Abrahae: The bosom of Abraham is mentioned in the Gospels (Mt 8:11; Lk 13:28; 16:22-25, 29-30) as a place for the righteous to go after death. The image might stem from that of loving parents providing a place of rest and security for children; e.g. Lk 11:7. Christian authors also wrote about the bosom of Abraham as a resting place for the just; e.g. Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 4; Amb. *De Abr.* 2.5.22; Caes. Ar. *Serm.* 165.3. For the range of meaning of *sinus*, see Strack, H.L. and P. Billerbeck. 1961. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 4 vols. München: CH Beck (2.225-7).

loco refrigerii: For Jerome, the *locus refrigerii* is nearly synonymous with the *sinus Abrahae*. For example, *Ep.* 60.3: *Lazarus uidetur in sinu Abraham locoque refrigerii*; *Ep.* 39.4: *unde et Abraham, licet in loco refrigerii, tamen apud inferos cum Lazaro scribitur*. The phrase *locus refrigerii* was not especially popular among Christian authors, appearing neither in Ambrose nor Augustine, for example, although Jerome used it three times. Its rareness implies that Jerome might have added this phrase to Vigilantius' list of destinations for souls. Abraham and a place of refreshment go hand-in-hand for Jerome, adding a third element to the list is more

rhetorically effective, and the addition does not alter the content of Jerome's paraphrase. A pun on *refrigerium* is also possible; compare this passage in Jerome's *Comm. ad Gal.* 3.6.8: *eos quoque, qui comedant et bibant, et dormiant et aliquid faciant ob refrigerium corporis...metere corruptionem.*

subter aram dei: The altar of God is described in Apoc. 6:9-11:

et cum aperuisset quintum sigillum uidi **subtus altare** animas interfectorum propter uerbum Dei et propter testimonium quod habebant. et clamabant uoce magna dicentes usquequo Domine sanctus et uerus non iudicas et uindicas sanguinem nostrum de his qui habitant in terra? et datae sunt illis singulae stolae albae et dictum est illis ut requiescerent tempus adhuc modicum...

When he opened the fifth seal, I saw **under the altar** the souls of those who had been slaughtered for the word of God and for the testimony they had given; they cried out with a loud voice, "Sovereign Lord, holy and true, how long will it be before you judge and avenge our blood on the inhabitants of the earth?" They were each given a white robe and told to rest a little longer...

This passage is most useful for understanding Vigilantius' view that the souls of martyrs remain in one fixed place after they die. Their fixed location may also have been an exercise in the virtue of patience as Cyprian argues in *De bon. pat.* 21. Augustine, *CD* 12.9, also wrote about spirits waiting in secret receptacles after death: *qui mortem obierunt, secretis animarum receptaculis sedibusque requiescit.* Victorinus of Pettau, in his *Comm. in Apoc.*, explained that martyrs' rewards will be perpetual; therefore they must wait for their due vengeance: *quia in nouissimo tempore etiam sanctorum remuneratio perpetua, et impiorum est uentura damnatio, dictum est eis exspectare* (PL 5.329C). Jerome did not treat Apoc. 6:9-11 elsewhere.

6.2 *Senatoriae uidelicet dignitatis sunt, ut non inter homicidas teterrimo carcere, sed in libera honestaque custodia in fortunatorum insulis et in campis elysiis recludantur.*

Evidently they are of senatorial rank and are not locked up in the foulest prison among murderers, but are kept under free and honorable custody on the Isles of the Blessed and the Elysian Fields.

Senatoriae...dignitatis: The legal language, beginning with this phrase, adds another dimension to the irony/sarcasm. See below on 6.3.

honestaque custodia: *Honestiores* in legal language referred to the privileged and makes sense here, but *humiliores* were in prison/custody more than *honestiores* (e.g. Ulp. *Dig.* 48.3.1; 26.10.3.16). For a full treatment of the distinction between the two terms, see Rilinger, R.1988.

Humiliores-Honestiores: Zu einer sozialen Dichotomie im Strafrecht der römischen Kaiserzeit. Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag.

6.3-4 *Tu deo leges pones, tu apostolis uincula inicies, ut usque ad diem iudicii teneantur custodia nec sint cum domino suo, de quibus scriptum est: Sequuntur agnum quocumque uadit? Si agnus ubique ergo et hi qui cum agno sunt ubique esse credendi sunt; et cum diabolus et daemones toto uagentur orbe et celeritate nimia ubique praesentes sint, martyres post effusionem sanguinis sui ara operientur inclusi et inde exire non poterunt?*

Will you set down the laws for God? Will you throw the apostles into chains so that they may be kept in custody until the Day of Judgment and that they may not be with their Lord? Of them it is written: “*They follow the lamb wherever he goes.*” If the lamb is everywhere, then those who are with the lamb must be believed to be everywhere. And while the devil and his demons wander throughout the world and appear in every place with excessive speed, will the martyrs, locked up, be trapped in an altar after pouring forth their blood and be unable to leave?

tu...tu: The parallel structure with increasing cola shows Jerome’s growing indignation.

deo leges pones: *Ponere* for *imponere*: *simplex pro composito*. *LHS* 2.298.

Sequuntur...uadit: Apoc. 14:4.

Si...credendi sunt: Jerome avoided delving into the precise meaning of this passage, only taking it at face value. Vigilantius, repeating his use of Apoc. 6:9, could have negated the validity of Jerome’s premises.

toto...orbe: Demons, much like the other creatures listed in CV 1, are able to range the earth at will.

celeritate: Demons’ ability to move quickly is well-attested, most notably in Athanasius’ VA 31: Τί γὰρ θαυμαστόν, εἰ λεπτοτέροις χρώμενοι σώμασι μᾶλλον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τοὺς

ἀρξαμένους ὀδεύειν ἑωρακότες, προλαμβάνουσι τῷ δρόμῳ καὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν; and Aug. *De div. daem.* 3.7.

cum...poterunt: This argument *a minore* contains the premise that martyrs should have at least the same abilities as demons, especially after they have shed their blood for Christ. Martyrs continued to be depicted as prisoners unfairly incarcerated, an image that perverted Vigilantius' depiction of them in a place of refreshment. For a similar understanding of this passage, see Lössl, J. 2005. "An Early Christian Identity Crisis Triggered by Changes in the Discourse on Martyrdom: The Controversy between Jerome of Stridon and Vigilantius of Calagurris." *More than a Memory: The Discourse of Martyrdom and the Construction of Christian Identity in the History of Christianity*: 97-116, especially 112.

6.5-6 *Dicis in libello tuo quod dum uiuimus mutuo pro nobis orare possumus. Postquam autem mortui fuerimus, nullius sit pro alio exaudienda oratio, praesertim cum martyres ultionem sui sanguinis obsecrantes impetrare non quiuerint.*

You say in your little pamphlet that while we live, we are able to pray for one another reciprocally; after we have died, however, one's prayer on behalf of another cannot be heard. This is especially true since the martyrs, even though they pray for someone to avenge their blood, are unable, according to you, to get what they desire.

Vigilantius' view on intercession is made more explicit here. Coinciding with what was paraphrased in 6.1-2, Vigilantius' premise was that martyrs rested in a place of refreshment until the Day of Judgment, unavailable to intercede in this interim period. His was a minority view, as Christian writers increasingly wrote about the usefulness of martyrs as intercessors; e.g. Prud. *Perist.* 1.15ff.; Maxim. Tur. *Ser.* 12.1-2; Amb. *De uid.* 9.55. For a discussion of the patron/client aspect seen in the relationship between petitioner and martyr, see Brown, *Cult*, pp. 56-58 and 60-63.

dicis...quod: The *quod*-clause became more common as an object clause in later Latin, although it was still less frequently employed than the accusative and infinitive construction. See

Adams, J. N. 2011. "Late Latin," in J. Clackson, ed. *A Companion to the Latin Language*, 257-83. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 280-81.

martyres ultionem: This understanding depended again on a reading of Apoc. 6:9. See note on 6.1.

impetrare non quiuerint: To negate *quere* instead of using *nequere* is Classical and especially Ciceronian; e.g. *Fam.* 14.1.5: "*non queo reliqua scribere.*" See Neue, F. 1892.

Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. 4 vols. Leipzig, 2.607ff.

6.7-8 *Si apostoli et martyres adhuc in corpore constituti possunt orare pro ceteris quando de se adhuc debent esse solliciti, quanto magis post coronas, uictorias et triumphos? Unus homo Moyses sexcentis milibus armatorum impetrat a deo ueniam, et Stephanus imitator Domini sui et primus martyr in Christo persecutoribus ueniam deprecatur, et postquam cum Christo esse coeperint, minus ualebunt?*

If apostles and martyrs, still in corporeal form, are able to pray for others when they ought to be concerned with their own welfare, how much more should they do so after their crowns, their victories and their triumphs? One man, Moses, gains pardon from God for six hundred thousand armed men; Stephen, an imitator of his Lord and the first martyr in Christ, prays for the pardon of his persecutors. Will they have less power after they have begun their life with Christ?

Moses...Stephanus: In Nm. 11, Moses, while leading six hundred thousand Israelites, heard them complain of their hardships on their long journey. As their guide, Moses prayed to God asking for his help to lead them, and God answered. Stephen, known as the first Christian martyr, prayed that God have mercy on his persecutors (Acts 7:60). While these are both examples of intercessory prayers, Moses and Stephen were alive when they prayed on behalf of others; therefore, Jerome's argument was not as convincing as he might have liked. His evidence only proved that he and Vigilantius believed the same thing about the living praying for the living.

6.9-10 *Paulus Apostolus ducentas septuaginta sex sibi dicit in nauis animas condonatas et postquam resolutus coeperit esse cum Christo, tunc ora clausurus est et pro his qui in toto orbe ad suum Euangelium crediderunt muttire non poterit, meliorque erit Vigilantius canis uiuens*

quam ille leo mortuus? Recte hoc de Ecclesiaste proponeres, si Paulum in spiritu mortuum confiterer.

Paul the Apostle says that two hundred and seventy-six souls were given to him on his ship, and, after he has begun to be with Christ unreservedly, then will he close his mouth and be unable to utter a word on behalf of those throughout the world who believed in his gospel? Then will Vigilantius, the living dog, be better than that dead lion? You would be using this passage of Ecclesiastes correctly, if I were to confess that Paul was dead in spirit.

Paulus: Acts 27:37. In this passage, Paul, having spoken to an angel of God, helped his fellow travelers avoid shipwreck by instructing them to run aground and cut the ship's ties to their lifeboats.

ad...crediderunt: *credere* does not typically take a preposition. In this case, the use of *ad* with an accusative is a construction taken from Greek, where πιστεύω may take the preposition εἰς, as in π. εἰς τὸν Θεόν in John 14:1 or Rom 10:10: καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

ora: Poetic plural. On the origin of this construction, see *LHS* 2.16.

canis uiuens: Ecclesiastes 9:4: *nemo est qui semper uiuat et qui huius rei habeat fiduciam melior est canis uiuens leone mortuo.* Vigilantius was the dog, the most contemptible animal, while Paul was likened to the noblest animal, the lion. For example, dogs are left out of the holy city in Apoc. 22:15. See also the Acts of Paul for the story of Paul and a lion. Also, in this imagined exchange, Jerome suggested how wrong his opponent would be if he appealed to this passage of Ecclesiastes. If Paul were dead in spirit, then Vigilantius, being alive, would have a better lot. However, as Jerome has argued, the holy are not dead, but sleeping. A living dog is nowhere considered better than a sleeping lion.

6.11-13 *Denique sancti non appellantur mortui, sed dormientes. Unde et Lazarus, qui resurrecturus erat, dormisse perhibetur. Et Apostolus uetat Thessalinicenses de dormientibus contristari.*

In fact, saints are not called dead, but sleeping. For this reason Lazarus, who had been resurrected, is considered to have been asleep. And the apostle forbids the Thessalonians to grieve over those who are merely sleeping.

non...dormientes: For more on Jerome's use of the euphemistic metaphor of sleep as death, see O'Connell, *Eschatology*, 74ff. The metaphor directly corresponds to Jerome's belief in a bodily resurrection: the body needed to be intact, therefore it could not die. Compare the story of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus (Greg. Tur. *GM* 94). O'Connell cited some scholars who believed that those like Vigilantius taught the erroneous version of this belief, "in which the soul loses all consciousness and in which it remains until all the dead awake at the general resurrection" (74-5). O'Connell rightly disagreed with them; Vigilantius did not write that the dead were in a coma.

Lazarus: John 11:11: *haec ait et post hoc dicit eis Lazarus amicus noster dormit sed uado ut a somno exsuscitem eum*. In addition to the Lazarus pericope, Jesus, on his way to the house of Jairus, said that the girl there was not dead, but sleeping: Lk 8:52/Mk 5:39/Mt 9:24. See also 1 Cor. 15:51. Jerome wrote in more detail concerning sleep and resurrection in the *Comm. in Is.* 8.26.19:

Unde et Lazarus qui euigilandus erat, a Domino dormiens appellatur. Omnes igitur martyres et sancti uiri, qui pro Christo fuderunt sanguinem, et quorum fuit tota uita martyrism, resurgent et euigilabunt, atque laudabunt Deum Creatorum suum, qui nunc habitant in puluere.

Whence even Lazarus, who had to be awakened, is called "sleeping" by the Lord. Therefore, all martyrs and holy men, who have shed blood for Christ and whose entire lives were a *martyrium*, will rise and keep watch, and they, who dwell now in dust, will praise God, their Creator.

Compare also the passage which Jerome quoted from Dan. 12:2: *Multi dormientium in terrae puluere resurgent.*" It is possible that Vigilantius' *puluisculum* attacked not only the size of relics

relative to the power supposed to be in them, but also the belief in a bodily resurrection. For more on resurrection, see Ch. 3, pp. 37-43.

Apostolus: 1 Thess. 4:13: *nolumus autem uos ignorare fratres de dormientibus, ut non contristemini*. Jerome elsewhere described the dead as merely sleeping as a means of consolation. See *Epp.* 39.6, 60.2, 75.1, 79.6, 108.29, 118.1, etc.

6.14-16 *Tu uigilans dormis et dormiens scribis, et proponis mihi librum apocryphum, qui sub nomine Ezrae a te et similibus tuis legitur, ubi scriptum est quod post mortem nullus pro aliis audeat deprecari. Quem ego librum numquam legi. Quid enim necesse est manus sumere quod ecclesia non recipit?*

You sleep when you are awake, and write in your sleep; and you recommend to me this apocryphal book that is read by you and those like you under the name of Esdras. In this book, it was written that after death, no one would dare to pray for others. Of course, I have never read this book - why should I take up in my hands what the church does not recognize?

uigilans...scribis: Jerome was still finding ways to play on his opponent's name.

apocryphum: Jerome referred to 4 Ezra 7:106ff as the passage Vigilantius used as evidence that martyrs were unable to intercede. For a closer analysis, see CV 4.6.

similibus tuis: Jerome might have been referring specifically to a narrow minority circle that held beliefs like Vigilantius', but contemporary and central authorities made use of this book, even though it was considered apocryphal. Ambrose quoted 4 Ezra on several occasions, for instance, *De bon. mort.* 10-12; John Chrys. *Hom.* 8.9; Ps.-Philo 33.5. 4 Ezra had been officially rejected as non-canonical in 405 by Pope Innocent, *Ep.* 6.7.13: *qui uero libri recipiantur in canone, breuis annexus ostendit. haec sunt quae desiderata moneri uoce uoluisti...Esdrae duo* (PL 20, 501f.).

6.17 *Nisi forte Balsamum mihi et Barbelo, et thesaurum Manichaei et ridiculum nomen Leosiborae <proferas>, et quia ad radices Pyrenaei habitas uicinusque es Hiberiae, Basilidis antiquissimi haeretici et imperitae scientiae incredibilia portenta perquiris et proponis quod totius orbis auctoritate damnatur: nam in commentariolo tuo quasi pro te faciens de Salomone sumis testimonium quod Salomon omnino non scripsit, ut qui habes alterum Ezram habeas et Salomonem alterum.*

Unless perhaps you should offer me Balsamus, and Barbelo, and the Treasure of Mani, and the ridiculous name of Leusiboras, then, because you live at the foot of the Pyrenees, and you are close to Iberia, you seek the unbelievable portents of Basilides, the most ancient heretic and a man of “knowledge” and you propose what is condemned by the authority of the world. For in your little book, you quote from Solomon as if he were in your corner, but he did not even write it, all so that you, because you have another Esdras, may have another Solomon.

Nisi...Leosiborae: Feiertag inexplicably left out the verb in this clause; *proferas* is a conjecture by G.A. Bussi (15th c.), and four subsequent editors adopted his change (see Feiertag 2005a, 3 and 15).

Balsamum: Balsamus is an example of a non-Jewish divinity given attributes of a Hebrew god, especially in magic. Balsamus is identified with the Syrian Baalshamin. See Preisendanz, *PGM* 4.1019, 12.494.

Barbelo: Transliterated from the Greek. A female mythological figure found in several forms of Gnosticism. Irenaeus, for example, wrote about her and her followers, the Barbeliotes (*Adv. haer.* 29): Ὑπέθεντο γὰρ Αἰῶνα τινὰ ἀνώλεθρον ἐν παρθενικῷ διάγοντι πνεύματι, ὃ Βαρβηλῶθ ὀνομάζουσι. For the orthography, see Feiertag (2005a, 35).

thesaurum Manichaei: Augustine quoted parts of this text in *De nat. bon.* 44ff. in addition to the *Epistula Fundamenti*. Accusations of Manichaeism were commonly and casually made, meaning little more than “heretic” in many instances. For more on Manichaeism, see Widengren, G. 1965. *Mani and Manichaeism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston; Lieu, S. 1992. *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. Tübingen: Mohr; Coyle, J.K. 2009. *Manichaeism and Its Legacy*. Leiden: Brill.

Leusiborae: Jerome had listed these major Gnostic deities previously in *Comm. in Is.* 17.64.4, *Comm. in Am.* 1.3, and *Ep.* 75. 3. In the latter, Jerome praised the recently deceased

Lucinius for not believing in them and explained how such names were deployed by those who cited them:

nequaquam suscipiens Armazel, Barbelon, Abraxan, Balsamum et ridiculum Leusiboram ceteraque magis portenta quam nomina, quae ad imperitorum et muliercularum animos concitandos quasi de hebraicis fontibus hauriunt barbaro simplices quosque terrentes sono, ut, quod non intellegunt, plus mirentur?

He in no way received Armagil, Barbelon, Abraxas, Balsamum, and the absurd Leusibora, and others who are more portents than names, which they draw as if from Hebrew sources to entice the minds of ignorant men and women, terrifying the simple people with the barbarous sounds so that they may admire them more because they do not understand them.

The name did not appear in Latin texts before Jerome except in a tractate of Priscillian, who had incorrectly transliterated the Greek from Job 38.39: “*tu capies Leosiboram, animas quoque dracones timore implebis?*” (*Tract.* 1.11). The Greek text reads: *θηρεύσεις δὲ λέουσιν βοράν, ψυχὰς δὲ δρακόντων ἐμπλήσεις*; the Vulgate: *numquid capies leaenae praedam et animam catulorum eius implebis?* Priscillian is thought to have perhaps understood the name as a “mythological figure in an apocryphon.” See Chadwick, H. 1976. *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 94.

Basilidis: Basilides was a Gnostic teacher active in the first half of the second century in Egypt. The best sources on his teachings and exegesis are Irenaeus’ *Adv. haer.* 1.24.3-7, Clement of Alexandria’s *Strom.* 7.106.4ff., Hippolytus’ *Ref.* 7.20-27. For an introduction to Basilides, see Layton, B. 1989. “The Significance of Basilides in Ancient Christian Thought.” *Representations* 28: 135-51; and Pearson, B.A. 2008. “Basilides the Gnostic,” in A. Marjanen and P. Luomanen, eds. *A Companion to Second-Century Christian “Heretics,”* 1-31. Leiden: Brill.

Basilides and Priscillian

Throughout the *CV*, Jerome accused Vigilantius of nearly every heretical association possible, including Priscillianism. Priscillian was bishop of Avila from 381-85 and the leader of

a successful ascetic movement. Because of his interest in the occult and his success, he attracted much negative attention and was accused of sorcery and Manichaeism. For this reason, he was tortured and executed by the emperor Maximus – the first case of a heretic put to death by the Roman state.¹ The way in which Priscillian's case had been handled continued to have effects and cause strife in Spain and in Gaul. Questions about who might be in communion with the priests involved in the trial were still discussed even at the Council of Turin that was convened at some time in/between 398/417,² many years after Priscillian's execution.

Because Priscillianists were also known to have used apocryphal texts, even texts with apocalyptic content, when Jerome accuses Vigilantius and his ilk of making unorthodox use of apocryphal texts, the accusation of Priscillianism may lie in the background. Even though accusations of heresy were fairly standard fare against religious opponents, there are specific connections between Priscillian and Vigilantius that make this accusation more than a blanket charge. For instance, they both made use of 4 Ezra.³ Also, Jerome, in the *De viris illustribus*, wrote that Priscillian had been accused of the heresy of Basilides;⁴ he accused Vigilantius of the same.⁵ Spain, in fact, was regarded as infected by Jerome who lumped its heresies, including

¹ For an in-depth study of Priscillian's teachings and the aftermath of his execution, see Chadwick, *Priscillian*.

² Chadwick, *Priscillian*, 160ff. For the possibility of two councils of Turin, see Kulikowski, M. 1996. "Two Councils of Turin." *JThS* 47 (1): 159-68.

³ Prisc. *Tract.* 3. See Chadwick, *Priscillian*, 60ff.

⁴ Jer. *De vir. illus.* 121. (*PL* 23, 711).

⁵ *CV* 6.17 (*CCSL* 79C, 15-16).

Priscillianism, together as *Iberae neniae*.⁶ But there is another connection: Basilides and Vigilantius both believed that sexual activity should be permissible for members of the church.⁷

Still, Vigilantius would have not approved of the extreme ascetic lifestyle of Priscillianists.⁸ He also would have complained about how Priscillian and his followers took their worship away from the church and began meeting outside of the city in private conventicles.⁹ He wrote that resources should be directed toward the local church and that members also should actively participate.¹⁰ It is far more probable that the controversy eventually turned Vigilantius against asceticism and that Jerome, a career ascetic amidst groups of women (much like Priscillian), was deflecting a possible accusation of Priscillianism against himself. It has already been shown that Jerome did the same in *Ep.* 61 against Vigilantius' accusations of Origenism.¹¹

Salomone: The apocryphal Odes of Solomon¹² might be a possibility, as several of the Odes treat topics that would have appealed to Vigilantius. For instance, Ode 19 specifically alludes to Daniel 2:45;¹³ Ode 36 to Daniel 7:13, both Odes being apocalyptic.¹⁴

⁶ See above on 6.2.

⁷ *CV* passim; Iren. *Adv. haer.* 1.24.5. In *Chron.* 2.48, Sulpicius described Priscillian's sexual deviance, as did Jerome in *Ep.* 133.3.

⁸ For instance, Sulpicius recounted that Hydatius and Ithacius, the bishops who charged Priscillian of heresy, subsequently accused all ascetics of Priscillianism. *Chron.* 2.50 (*CSEL* 1, 103).

⁹ See Bowes, K. 2001. "...*Nec sedere in uillam*; Villa Churches, Rural Piety and the Priscillian Controversy," in T. Burns and J. Eadie. *Urban Centers and Rural Contexts in Late Antiquity*, 323-48. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

¹⁰ *CV* 13.2: *tu prohibeas Hierosolymam in usus sanctorum aliqua sumptuum solatia dirigi*; 15.1-3: *si omnes se clauiserint et fuerint in solitudine, quis celebrabit ecclesias? Quis saeculares homines lucrifaciet? Quis peccantes ad uirtutes poterit cohortari?*

¹¹ See Ch. 2, p. 29.

¹² For the translation and commentary, I refer to Harris, J.R. and A. Mingana. 1920. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

6.18 *Et si tibi placuerit, legito fictas reuelationes omnium patriarcharum et prophetarum, et cum illas didiceris, inter mulierum textrina cantato, immo legendas propone in tabernis tuis, ut facilius per has nenias uulgi indoctum prouoces ad bibendum.*

Also, if it is to your liking, read the made-up revelations of all the patriarchs and prophets; and once you have learned them, sing them in the company of weaving women. Better still, suggest that they be read in your taverns! Through these ditties, you can more easily encourage your ignorant lackeys to top off their drinks.

legito...cantato: See Ch. 2, p. 35 for the connection between this passage and Rufinus. In Classical and medieval literature, women would often sing while weaving (e.g. Circe and Calypso, Hom. *Od.* 5.61-62, 10.221-22; Athen. *Deip.* 14.618de). Here, Jerome suggests that Vigilantius' words were on par with the songs of weaving women.

nenias: Jerome described Vigilantius' works before as *neniae* (CV 3.5). More specifically, "neniae" is the right choice, as Jerome has written about similar trifles, especially from Spain, which seem to have infected the unlearned (*Epp.* 57.13, 109.4, 120.10, 143.2, 152.9; *Comm. in Is.* 10, praef.; *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 1.24, 2.25, 2.33; *Comm. in Mt.* praef.; *Comm. in Ez.* 11.38; *CJ* 37; *In Hier.* 4; *Prol. in Pent.*).

¹³ Harris, *Odes*, 307ff.

¹⁴ *ibid.* 387.

Chapter VII

Jerome responded in this section to Vigilantius' polemic about lighting candles. He defended his proper use of them and corrected what he assumed must have been Vigilantius' misunderstanding of the practice.

7.1-2 *Cereos autem non clara luce accendimus, sicut frustra calumniaris, sed ut noctis tenebras hoc solacio temperemus et uigilemus ad lumen, ne tecum dormiamus in tenebris. Quod si aliqui per imperitiam et simplicitatem saecularium hominum uel certe religiosarum feminarum, de quibus uere possumus dicere: Confiteor: zelum dei habent, sed non secundum scientiam, hoc pro honore martyrum faciunt, quid inde perdis?*

Moreover, we do not light candles in broad daylight, as you falsely charge to no purpose, but we do so in order to temper the shadows of nightfall by means of this comfort. We also watch for the dawn, so that we may not sleep in darkness with you. And, if some secular men, through ignorance and simplicity, or some religious women, about whom we can truly say: "*I confess, they have zeal for God, but not according to knowledge,*" do this in honor of martyrs, what do you lose from this practice?

noctis tenebras: Jerome has been inconsistent about whether fear of nocturnal shadows were legitimate. In *Ep.* 22.3, he quoted Ps. 90:5: "*non timebis a timore nocturno.*" In addition, *tenebras temperare* is an uncommon phrase and used by Jerome six of the eleven times attested in antiquity. The phrase was probably taken from Tertullian's *Adversus Hermogenem* 29: *Nam et lumen non statim splendore solis impleuit, et tenebras non statim solatio lunae temperauit.* Tertullian argued that God made order out of his creation at the beginning of the world and everything became complete; for, *materia erit postea uisibilis et perfecta*. Yet, if Jerome imagined that one could take comfort in lighting candles at night, the action might have the opposite effect: *taedis, lucernis, cereis, sebaciis et ceteris nocturni luminis instrumentis clarescunt tenebrae* (Apul. *Meta.* 4.19).

uigilemus ad lumen: There are passages which support staying awake to battle the darkness: Prov. 20:13: *noli diligere somnum ne te egestas opprimat aperi oculos tuos et saturare*

panibus, and Apoc. 16:15: *beatus qui uigilat et custodit uestimenta sua ne nudus ambulet et uideant turpitudinem eius*, for example. For the relevance of the latter passage, see CV 11.

zelum...scientiam: Rm. 10:2: *aemulationem Dei habent sed non secundum scientiam*.

7.3-4 *Causabantur quondam et apostoli quod periret unguentum, sed Domini uoce correpti sunt. Neque enim ipse Christus indigebat unguento nec martyres lumine cereorum, et tamen illa mulier in honore Christi hoc fecit deuotioque mentis eius recipitur.*

At one time, even the apostles were alleging that the oil was going to waste; but they were chastised by the voice of God. For Christ was not in need of oil, nor the martyrs in need of the light of candles. Nevertheless, that woman did this in honor of Christ, and the devotion of her mind was welcomed.

quod: *Quod*, *quia*, or *quoniam* with a personal verb often introduces an indirect statement in Late Latin. See *LHS* 2.577.

periret unguentum: It was a customary Jewish practice to pour unguents on the head at feasts: Ps. 23:5, Eccl. 9:8. After Jesus had arrived at Bethany, Mary anointed him, an act that inspired some of the apostles to ask whether the oil was being wasted (Mt. 26:8). To them, he replied, “*quid molesti estis? mulieri opus bonum operata est in me.*” Jerome argued that Vigilantius, taking issue with the cost of candles, was misplacing his priorities.

7.5-6 *Et quicumque accendunt cereos, secundum fidem suam habent mercedem, dicente Apostolo: Unusquisque in suo sensu abundet. Idolatras appellas huiuscemodi homines?*

Whoever lights candles has a reward according to his faith. The apostle says, “*Let each person abound in his own meaning.*” Do you call men of this sort idolaters?

Jerome cites Rm. 14.5, where Paul told strong believers not to look with contempt upon the weak. The underlying message is that each person will be rewarded (or punished) in proportion to his deeds, and that Vigilantius should not criticize a few ignorant believers. Jerome used this verse several times throughout his works, specifically to apologize for other Christians, starting in 406, e.g. *Ep.* 119.11, 130.14, the latter being the most similar:

alii aedificent ecclesias, uestiant parietes marmorum crustis, columnarum moles aduehant earumque deaurent capita pretiosum ornatum non sentientia, ebore argentoque ualuas et gemmis aurea uel aurata distinguant altaria - non reprehendo, non abnuo; unusquisque in sensu suo abundet.

Some may build churches, dress their walls with inlaid marble, transport large columns, the tops of which some may gild with precious ornamentation, some may cover church doors with ivory and silver and the golden altars with gold and gems. I do not rebuke them, nor do I reject them. Let each person abound in his meaning.

Cf. also 1 Cor. 15:41: *alia claritas solis, alia claritas lunae, et alia claritas stellarum; stella enim ab stella differt in claritate.*

Idolatrias...homines: As in several instances throughout this text (see 7.9, for example), Jerome closed his argument with a question, and, while effective, the point made was rather thin.

7.7-9 *Non diffiteor omnes nos qui Christo credimus de idolatriae errore uenisse. Non enim nascimur, sed renascimur christiani. Et quia quondam colebamus idola, nunc deum colere non debemus, ne simili eum uideamur cum idolis honore uenerari?*

I do not deny that all of us who believe in Christ have come to our faith from the error of idolatry; for we are not born, but are reborn as Christians. Because we used to worship idols, we should not worship God now, because we may seem to worship God with a similar honor once given to idols?

de idolatriae errore uenisse: Augustine agreed soon after his conversion that some Christians were behaving in ways that were influenced by pagan practice. See, for example, *Ep.* 22.3, written in 393, and *Ep.* 29.11, written in 395. Cf. 1 Cor. 12:2.

renascimur Christiani: Baptism may be the way to be “born again:” e.g. Aug. *De nat.* 2.12.17; see also Faust. *De grat.* 1.19.

simili...honore: *Similis* typically takes a dative or genitive, but Jerome has elsewhere used the adjective with *cum* + an ablative; e.g. *Ep.* 126.1: *simili cum brutis animantibus condicione subsistat.*

7.10-11 *Illud fiebat idolis et idcirco detestandum est, hoc fit martyribus et ideo recipiendum est. Nam et absque martyrum reliquiis per totas orientis ecclesias quando legendum est Euangelium*

accenduntur luminaria iam sole rutilante non utique ad fugandas tenebras, sed ad signum laetitiae demonstrandum.

That was done for idols and should therefore be detested; this is done for martyrs and should thus be accepted. For, even apart from the relics of the martyrs, candles are lit in every church of the East when the Gospel ought to be read while the sun is already reddening at dawn, certainly not for the purpose of chasing shadows away, but for showing a sign of joy.

Illud...hoc: Note the striking parallel structure of word order and word numbers, and the *uariatio* with *idcirco* and *ideo* as well as the different compound verbs.

orientis ecclesias: Jerome appealed to the eastern churches as an authority previously (CV 2.2-3). Cf. Aeth. *Itin.* 24.4, where she described how candles were lit in the cave of the Anastasis and the Lucernare hymns were sung.

laetitiae: Compare Isid. *Etym.* 7.12.29-30, one of the few ancient citations of this passage:

Acolythi Graece, Latine ceroferarii dicuntur, a deportandis cereis, quando legendum est Euangelium, aut sacrificium offerendum. Tunc enim accedunt luminaria ab eis et deportantur, non ad effugandas tenebras, dum sol eodem tempore rutilat, sed ad signum laetitiae demonstrandum, ut sub typo luminis corporalis illa lux ostendatur de qua in Euangelio legitur: "*Erat lux uera, quae inluminat omnem hominem uenientem in hunc mundum.*"

7.12 *Unde et uirgines illae euangelicae semper habent accensas lampadas, et ad apostolos dicitur: Sint lumbi uestri accincti et lucernae in manibus uestris; et de Iohanne baptista: Ille erat lucerna lucens, ut sub typo luminis corporalis illa lux ostendatur, de qua in Psalmo legimus: Lucerna pedibus meis uerbum tuum, Domine, et lumen semitis meis.*

For this reason, the virgins of the Gospel always have their lamps lit, and it is said to the apostles: "*Let your loins be girded and your lamps in your hands.*" Of John the Baptist: "*He was a shining lamp,*" so that, under this type of bodily radiance, the light may be revealed which we read of in the Psalms: "*Your word is a lamp for my feet and a light for my paths.*"

uirgines...euangelicae: Mt 25:4.

Sint...uestris: Lk 12:35: *sint lumbi uestri praecincti et lucernae ardentes.*

ille...lucens: Jn 5:35: *ille erat lucerna ardens et lucens.*

lucerna...meis: Ps 118:105. Overall, Jerome used a barrage of citations pertaining to lights and lamps that did not help reveal the core of his argument in response to Vigilantius and could have been used in a variety of unrelated contexts. For instance, both Augustine and Ambrose understood the passage from Luke above to encourage continence (*Quaest. Eu.* 2.25; *Exp. Ps.* 14.12, respectively).

Chapter VIII

8.1 *Male facit ergo Romanus episcopus, qui super mortuorum hominum Petri et Pauli, secundum nos ossa ueneranda, secundum te uile puluisculum, offert domino sacrificia, et tumulos eorum Christi arbitratur altaria?*

Therefore, is the bishop of Rome doing something wrong when, over the bones of the mortal men, Peter and Paul, bones considered worthy of veneration by us and cheap dust by you, he offers sacrifices to the Lord and considers their tombs altars of Christ?

secundum nos...puluisculum: The balanced prepositional phrases emphasize the stark difference in the content of their beliefs.

8.2 *Et non solum unius urbis, sed totius orbis errant episcopi, qui cauponem Vigilantium contemnentes, ingrediuntur basilicas mortuorum, in quibus puluis uilissimus et fauilla nescio quae iacet linteamine colligata, ut polluta omnia polluat et quasi sepulcra pharisaica foris dealbata sint, cum intus immundo cinere sordeant.*

Of course the bishops not only of one city, but of the whole world are clearly wrong when they, slighting Innkeeper Vigilantius, enter the basilicas of the dead, in which lie “worthless dust, and some sort of ash, wrapped in linen,” so that, being polluted, it may pollute all else and, like the sepulchers of the Pharisees, may be whitened on the outside while they are soiled with unclean ash within.

unius...orbis: This opposition pun goes back to Ovid (*F.* 2.683: *Romanae spatium est urbis et orbis idem*) and is favored by Jerome; e.g. *Ep.* 146.1: *nec latera Romanae urbis ecclesia, altera totius orbis aestimanda est.*

puluis uilissimus: The phrase is unique to Jerome and of the five instances, three occur in the CV when Jerome used Vigilantius’ words against him: *In Am.* 3.8.4; CV 8.2, 10.5, 10.7; V. *Pauli* 17. Jerome referenced Vigilantius’ “*puluisculum*” but changed the phrasing. Perhaps this is mere *uariatio*. Jerome probably intended to overturn Vigilantius’ polemical diminutive with a phrase including a superlative, especially after he set up the parallel in the previous sentence: “*uile puluisculum.*”

sepulcra pharisaica: Feiertag and Rebenich missed Mt. 23:27: *uae uobis scribae et Pharisei hypocritae quia similes estis sepulchris dealbatis quae a foris parent hominibus speciosa intus uero plena sunt ossibus mortuorum et omni spurcitia.*

8.3 *Et post haec de barathro pectoris sui caenosam spurcitiam euomens audet dicere: ERGO CINERES SUOS AMANT ANIMAE MARTYRUM ET CIRCUMVOLANT EOS SEMPERQUE PRAESENTES SUNT, NE FORTE, SI ALIQUIS PRECATOR ADVENERIT, ABSENTES AUDIRE NON POSSINT?*

And after these words, vomiting up the grimy filth from the pit of his body, he dares to say: “Do the souls of the martyrs love their own ashes and flit around them, always being present, so that, should someone by chance approach to pray, they may be close enough to hear every word?”

post haec: Probably in reference to one of the statements cited about “*puluiscula*.”

barathro: This Greek term is used in comic contexts to mean “gullet.” Cf. Plaut. *Curc.*

121b: *Age effunde hoc cito in barathrum*. See also Mart. 1.87.3; 3.81.3. Coupled with the imagery already seen in Vigilantius’ heretical parent, Jovinian, this sense is the most fitting.

caenosam spurcitiam: Cf. *Ep.* 109.1: “*putorem spurcissimum*.” Jerome’s use of *spurcitia* is probably inspired by Mt. 23:27 to which he referred in the previous sentence.

Ergo: What led to this concluding provocative question must have followed the section on intercessory prayer in Vigilantius’ text (CV 6). The issue is one of ubiquitousness; for saints’ *praesentia*, see Brown, *Cult*, 86-105.

circumuolant: Vigilantius imagined a wispy and restless existence of dead spirits as described in epic; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.427; *ibid.* 6.119; Stat. *Th.* 12.55-56. He could also have had in mind the passage from Ez. 13.20:

*dicit Dominus Deus ecce ego ad puluillos uestros quibus uos capitis **animas uolantes** et disrumpam eos de brachiis uestris et dimittam animas quas uos capitis...*

Therefore the Lord God says: Behold [I declare] against your cushions, with which you seize **flying spirits**, and I will tear them from your arms, and I will let go the souls that you catch...

In his commentary on this passage, Jerome wrote:

has autem dicunt Hebraei maleficis artibus eruditas per necromantias et Pythium spiritum, qualis fuit illa quae uisa est suscitasse animam Samuelis, et in actibus apostolorum, cuius diuinitas multos dominis rebus acquirerebat, de qua ad apostoli Pauli imperium immundus eiectus est spiritus.

It is probable that Vigilantius, having shown anxiety for potentially pagan practices, deliberately made such flying spirits seem ridiculous. For more on spirits of the dead, see Bömer, F. 1943.

Ahnenkult und Ahnenglaube im alten Rom. Leipzig: Teubner; Cumont, F. 1949. *Lux Perpetua*.

Paris: Geuthner, pp. 392ff.; and Johnston, S.I. 1999. *Restless Dead: Encounters between the*

Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece. Berkeley: University of California Press.

8.4-6 *O portentum in terras ultimas deportandum! Rides de reliquiis martyrum, et cum auctore huius haereseos Eunomio ecclesiis Christi calumniam struis, nec tali societate terreris, ut eadem contra nos loquaris quae ille contra ecclesiam loquitur? Omnes enim sectatores eius basilicas apostolorum et martyrum non ingrediuntur, ut scilicet mortuum adorent Eunomium, cuius libros maioris auctoritatis arbitrantur quam Euangelia.*

O portent, that deserves to be deported to the farthest reaches of the earth! Do you laugh at the relics of the martyrs, and, along with Eunomius, the author of this heresy, do you construct false accusations to damage the churches of Christ? Are you not terrified to keep such company, to speak the same things against us that he speaks against the church? In fact, all of his followers decline to enter the basilicas of the apostles and martyrs, evidently so that they may worship the dead Eunomius, whose books they consider of greater authority than the Gospel.

portentum...deportandum: Rebenich, *Jerome*, 196 points out Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.40: *O scelus, o portentum in ultimas terras exportandum!* The comparison reveals Jerome's pun as the better of the two. Cf. *Ep.* 109.2: *O infelicem hominem, et omni lacrimarum fronte plangendum.*

Eunomio: Eunomius, bishop of Cyzicus in the mid-fourth century, was the leader of an Arian sect. See *CTh* 16.5 *passim* and 16.6.7 for legal decrees against him and his followers. For more on Eunomius, see Uthemann, K.-H. 1993. "Die Sprache der Theologie nach Eunomius von Cyzicus." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 104 (2): 143-175; Vaggione, R.P. 2000. *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Most of Eunomius' works

do not survive save for material cited by Basil of Caesarea (*Adv. Eun.*) and Gregory of Nyssa (*Con. Eun.*), his detractors. Elsewhere in his works, Jerome equates Eunomius with a motley crew: Marcion, Arius, and Mani (e.g. *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 2.17; *Comm. in Ez.* 10.32), “*qui dicunt: spiritum sanctum non numeramus cum patre et filio*” (*Tract. in Ps.* 147). By bringing up Eunomius, Jerome suggested that Vigilantius belonged on the same list as these established heretics. According to Gregory of Nyssa, Eunomius, like Jerome’s Vigilantius, was a drunk and a buffoon (*Eun.* 1.611, 404, 493); in other words, he advocated a moderate form of asceticism (Vaggione, *Eunomius*, 181-90). However, Jerome cites Eunomius as Vigilantius’ predecessor in protesting against relic worship. While Eunomius’ precise beliefs remain unknown, his student, Philostorgus, complained about what seemed like excessive worship of Constantine (*HE* 2.17), which may have been known to Jerome.

calumniam struis: *Struere* is a Ciceronian verb often meaning to devise something negative: e.g. “*aliquid calamitatis*,” *Clu.* 64.178; “*odium in alios*,” *Or.* 2.51.208, etc.

tali societate: This phrase has a negative connotation, used also to describe the followers of Pelagius who dared to believe that humans could be born without sin (*Ep.* 133.3).

eadem...loquitur: Note the parallel structure used effectively to make Vigilantius seem in no way different from Eunomius.

Omnes...ingrediuntur: Followers of Eunomius worshiped in private spaces outside of churches and basilicas. Socrates, wrote that Eunomius would gather followers in various domestic spaces and read over his treatises with them (*Eccl. Hist.* 5.20.4).

8.7 *Et in ipso esse credunt columnen ueritatis, sicut aliae haereses paracletum in Montanum uenisse contendunt et Manichaeum ipsum dicunt esse paracletum.*

They even believe that the pillar of truth is in that very man, just as other heresies claim that the Paraclete entered Montanus, and they say that Mani himself was the Paraclete.

columnen ueritatis: 1 Tim. 3:15: *si autem tardauero ut scias quomodo oporteat te in domo Dei conuersari quae est ecclesia Dei uiui columna et firmamentum ueritatis*. Cf. CJ 11, where Jerome referred sarcastically to John of Jerusalem as the “*columna ueritatis ac fidei*.”

Montanum: Jerome wrote to Marcella about the deviant practices of Montanists, which included extreme fasting and the inclusion of women among their clergy (*Ep.* 41.3). For more on Montanism, see Trevett, C. 1996. *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manichaeum: See note on CV 6.17. Where Montanists were inspired by the Paraclete, Manichaeans thought Mani was the Paraclete. See Aug. *C. Ep. Man.* 6, 7, 8; *CF* 13.17, 32.17.

8.8 *Scribit aduersum haeresim tuam, quae olim erupit contra ecclesiam, ne et in hoc quasi repertor noui sceleris glorieris, Tertullianus uir eruditissimus uolumen insigne, quod Scorpiace uocat rectissimo nomine, quia arcuato uulnere in ecclesiae corpus uenena diffundit; quae olim appellabatur Caina haeresis, et multo tempore dormiens uel sepulta, nunc a Dormitantio suscitata est.*

Against your heresy, which broke out against the church long ago (do not glory in this matter as if you were the inventor of a new crime), Tertullian, a most learned man, wrote a famous work which he calls most fittingly *Scorpiace*, because the heresy, which was once called the heresy of Cain, injects poison into the body of the church with a bow-shaped wound, and it has slept, or been buried, for a long time, but has now been awakened by Dormitanti.

The architecture of this sentence is complex and clever. Tertullian and Vigilantius are juxtaposed effectively to show how uneven the comparison is. The verb initial position introduces the proper authority, Tertullian, as opposed to Vigilantius’ role in this “scelus,” which is subordinate and unemphatic. Vigilantius, as Jerome effectively demonstrated, was not the first author of this heresy.

haeresim: In his *Scorpiace*, Tertullian wrote against Gnostics who taught that martyrdoms were unnecessary (e.g. *Scorp.* 1, 2). Cf. Tert. *Adv. Val.* 30, Iren. *Haer.* 1.24.6; Clem. *Strom.* 4.81. Jerome implies here that Vigilantius’ views mimicked the Gnostics’. For more on

the Gnostic attitudes against martyrdom, see Frend, W.H.C. 1954. "Gnostic Sects and the Roman Empire." *JEH* 5: 25-37.

Tertullianus: For Jerome's opinion of Tertullian, see Mohrmann, "Saint Jérôme," 111-12 who states, citing examples, that Jerome admired his erudition, but did not forget that he became and was condemned as a Montanist.

uolumen: For Jerome's use of the term, see Arns, P. E. 1953. *La technique du livres d'après Saint Jérôme*. Paris: E. de Boccard, pp. 118-22.

Scorpiace: Feiertag's text reads Scorpiac†am†; see his note (2005a, 39).

Caina haeresis: See Iren. *Adv. Haer.* 1.31; Epi. *Pan.* 38; Tert. *De bapt.* 1. Cainites believed that Cain came from a higher power than Abel and that all of the historically "negative" people from the Bible were truly good. The positive view of Cain comes from Jewish and Gnostic interpretations. For a general introduction to this group, see Pearson, B.A. 1990. "Cain and the Cainites," in Pearson, ed. *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*, 95-107. Minneapolis: Fortress.

8.9-11 *Miror quod non dicas nequaquam perpetranda martyria, Deum enim, qui sanguinem hircorum taurorumque non quaerat, multo magis hominum non requirere. Quod cum dixeris, immo etsi non dixeris, ita habebis quasi dixeris. Qui enim reliquias martyrum asseris esse calcandas, prohibes sanguinem fundi, qui nullo honore condignus est.*

I marvel at how you do not say that martyrdoms should in no way be carried out, for God, who does not seek the blood of goats or bulls, seeks far less the blood of man. When you say this, rather, even if you do not say it, you will still be regarded as though you did. For you, asserting that martyrs' relics must be trampled over, prevent blood that is worthy of no honor from being shed.

perpetranda martyria: The force of *perpetrare* may be both positive and negative. For the range, see *TLL* s.v. 1631.76-1632.47. For Jerome, the verb has more positive connotations in the context of martyrdoms (e.g. *Epp.* 84.11 and 130.5). However, because Vigilantius would not agree with the positive meaning in the context, the ambivalent nature of the verb is appropriate.

Deum...quaerat: Is. 1.11, where God chastised the Israelites for performing sacrifices instead of properly devoting their lives to him. In Jerome's *Comm. in Is.* 1.1.11, he cited Ps. 49:9 as a passage with a parallel sentiment. He probably imagined that Vigilantius equated martyrdom with human sacrifice.

Quod...quasi dixeris: To cast oneself in suspicion yields an accusation regardless of whether a deed was done. Cf. *Ep.* 128.3: *Quare solus cum sola, et non cum arbitris sedes, ut cum ipse non pecces, aliis peccare uidearis.*

asseris: As Jerome just stated, Vigilantius will appear to have said something he did not - nowhere in the citations Jerome provided did Vigilantius hint that martyrs deserved no honor at all, or that their remains were to be treated in a certain way. Perhaps Vigilantius could have replied to Jerome by citing Ps. 50:16-19:

libera me de sanguinibus Deus Deus salutis meae laudabit lingua mea iustitiam tuam /
Domine labia mea aperies et os meum adnuntiabit laudem tuam / non enim uis ut
uictimam feriam nec holocaustum tibi placet / sacrificium Dei spiritus contribulatus cor
contritum et humiliatum Deus non dispicies.

Free me from the guilt of blood, God, God of my salvation, and my tongue will sing of your justice. You will open my lips, Lord, and my mouth will declare your praise; for you do not want me to make a sacrifice, nor is a burnt offering pleasing to you. My sacrifice, spirit of God, is a broken heart, contrite and humbled, and you, God, will not despise.

reliquias...calcandas: *calcare* is an appropriate verb choice here, often having the sense of scorning or abusing. *TLL* s.v. 137.35. Cf. *Jer. Comm. in Am.* 1.2: *nunc autem pro rebus uilissimis, calciamentis, quibus puluerem calcant et fimum, pretiosam hominis animam uendiderunt.*

Chapter IX

Vigils dominate this chapter. Jerome was primarily concerned with arguing for vigils in regular worship.

9.1-2 *De uigiliis et pernoctationibus in basilicis martyrum saepe celebrandis, in altera epistula, quam ante hoc ferme biennium sancto Ripario presbytero scripseram, respondi breuiter. Quod si ideo eas aestimas respuendas, ne saepe uideamur Pascha celebrare et non sollemnes post annum exercere uigilias, ergo et die dominico non sunt Christo offerenda sacrificia, ne resurrectionis domini crebro Pascha celebremus et incipiamus non unum Pascha habere, sed plurima.*

Concerning the vigils and night watches that ought to be practiced frequently in the basilicas of the martyrs, I responded briefly in another letter written to the holy presbyter Riparius nearly two years ago. But you judge that they should be rejected, lest we seem to celebrate Easter too often and seem not to exercise the proper vigils every year. Therefore, on the Lord's Day, sacrifices must not be offered to Christ lest we celebrate the Easter of our Lord's resurrection too frequently and we begin to have not one Easter, but many.

uigiliis et pernoctationibus: Note the *uariatio*.

in altera epistula: Ep. 109.

si ideo: Jerome assumed that Vigilantius read Ep. 109 and continued to speak against vigils in response to Jerome's criticism.

eas aestimas respuendas: Homoeoteleuton and crescendo in accordance with Behaghel's Law.

ergo...sed plurima: Jerome next placed a hypothetical premise in Vigilantius' mouth, namely that too many vigils detracted from their ceremonial impact at Easter with a *reductio ad absurdum*. If daily vigils negated the validity of Easter vigils, then the celebration of the Eucharist would have the same outcome. Jerome might have concluded that people should only pray during Easter as well.

9.3 *Error autem et culpa iuuenum uilissimarumque mulierum, qui per noctem saepe deprehenditur, non est religiosus hominibus imputandus, quia et in uigiliis Paschae tale aliquid fieri plerumque conuincitur, et tamen paucorum culpa non praeiudicat religioni, qui et absque uigiliis possunt errare uel in suis, uel in alienis domibus.*

However, religious men should not be charged with the error and the guilt of young men and the most worthless women, faults that are often detected at night. While such a thing generally is shown to occur during Easter vigils, nevertheless, the guilt of a few, who are able to err even without vigils, in their homes as well in the homes of others, should not be injurious to devotion.

error...culpa: The two terms are often used synonymously, *TLL* s.v. *culpa* 1298.70.

Jerome, however, distinguishes the words in *Ep.* 140.11: *aliena enim a nobis sunt uitia, quae saepe uoluntate, interdum ignorance et errore committimus, et tamen, cum non sit uoluntas in crimine, error in culpa est.*

uilissimarumque mulierum: See note on *mulierculae*, 3.5.

9.4-5 *Apostolorum fidem Iudae proditio non destruxit. Et nostras ergo uigilias malae aliorum uigiliae non destruent.*

Judas' betrayal did not destroy the faith of the apostles. So, the improper vigils of others will not destroy ours.

Iudae: Jerome made a similar argument to Eustochium, claiming that: *neque enim undecim apostoli Iudae prodicione sunt fracti* (*Ep.* 22.38).

malae...uigiliae: Vigils were described as evil by Jerome only here and in *Comm. in Is.* 29.20: *et succisi sunt siue deleti omnes qui uigilabant super iniquitatem, quorum propter malas uigilias non dormitat interitus*. Augustine wrote variously about the behavior of fellow Christians at vigils and martyr-feasts, some people being susceptible to immoderate consumption of wine; e.g. *Conf.* 6.2.2; *Ep.* 22.2-6; *Ep.* 64; *Serm.* 230, 252.4. Cf. John Chrysostom who chastised fellow Christians for allowing vigils to deteriorate into sexual revels: μή ποιήσατε πάλιν τὴν ἡμέραν νύκτα διὰ τῆς μέθης καὶ τῆς κραιπάλης, καὶ τῶν ἁσμάτων τῶν πορνικῶν (*Hom. in Mart. PG* 50.663); Caesarius' sermons against sexual activity in general during the vigils on important feast days (*Serm.* 1.12, 44.3,e tc.).

9.6-7 *Quin potius pudicitiae uigilare cogantur, qui libidini dormiunt. Quod enim semel fecisse bonum est, non potest malum esse, si frequentius fiat, aut, si aliqua culpa uitanda est, non ex eo quod saepe, sed ex eo quod fit aliquando culpabile est.*

Rather, let those who sleep to satisfy their lust be compelled to stay awake for chastity. In fact, what is good to have done once, cannot be evil if it is done more frequently; or, if any sin is to be avoided, it is culpable not because it happens often, but because it happens at all.

quin...dormiunt: Cf. Priap. 47.5-6: *et ipse longa nocte dormiat solus / libidinis incitatus erucis*.

Quod...fiat: This is the exact opposite of the Delphic maxim “nothing in excess” (Pl.

Prot. 343b: ἐν Δελφοῖς, γράψαντες ταῦτα ἃ δὴ πάντες ὕμνοῦσιν, γνῶθι σαυτὸν καὶ μηδὲν ἄγαν),

to which Jerome had previously subscribed. When addressing Heliodorus’ great sorrow over the death of his nephew, Nepotian, Jerome advised him in *Ep.* 60.7 to be “*memor illius sententiae*:

‘ne quid nimis.’” Even in his praise of Paula’s devotion to fasting, he agreed with past

philosophers who counseled moderation (*Ep.* 108.21). Augustine also used the phrase several

times, similarly approving of statement, e.g.: *in quibus omnibus tenendum est: ne quid nimis et*

maxime in his, quae ad corporis sensus pertinentia uoluuntur temporibus et continentur locis

(*De doc. christ.* 2.39). Cf. also Greg. Nyss. *In Eccl. hom.* 6, 375.15: ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὸ Μέτρον

ἄριστον ἀπεφώνητο, ὁ δὲ τὸ Μηδὲν ἄγαν ἐνομοθέτησεν. However, the odd contradictory

statement is less noteworthy than the sophistry of this particular passage. The whole of 9.6-7

presents an argument that appears as two sides of the same coin; the frequency of any act does

little to change its essential goodness or badness.

9.8-9 *Non uigilemus itaque diebus Paschae, ne expectata diu adulterorum desideria compleantur, ne occasionem peccandi uxor inueniat, ne maritali non possit recludi clauae. Ardentius appetitur quidquid est rarius.*

Thus, let us not keep watch on the days of Easter lest the long-awaited desires of adulterers be satisfied, lest the wife find an opportunity for sin, lest she be unable to be locked in with her husband’s key. What occurs more rarely is more ardently sought.

maritali clauae: With the mention of the key, Jerome reversed the “*exclusus amator*” motif popular in elegiac poetry. The door, a physical and symbolic barrier, prevented an eager lover from gaining access to his beloved, although he might often try to enter using clever devices (e.g.

Ov. AA 1.351ff.). For more on the classical motif, see Copley, F. 1956. *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. Jerome implied that a wife would let a lover in, if locked in her room for too long. One cannot ignore the *double entendre* in Jerome's description of a husband's ineffective key. For the door as a symbol of female genitalia, see Adams, J.N. 1982. *Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, p. 89.

ne...ne...ne: The asyndetic anaphora makes the consequences of infrequent vigils appear all the more dire.

Ardentius...rarius: This epigrammatic statement is Jerome's alone. Jerome was fond of proverbial expressions and often cited them from other writers, of comedy and satire, whom he particularly enjoyed. For Jerome's use of comedy, see Luebeck, E. 1872. *Hieronymus quos nouerit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit*. Leipzig: Teubner, pp. 106-115.

Chapter X

Vigilantius' skepticism concerning the use of miracles in conversion is the focus of this chapter.

For more on miracles in late antique literature: Van Dam, R. 1993. *Saints and their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; De Nie, G. 2003. *Word, Image, and Experience: Dynamics of Miracle and Self-Perception in Sixth-Century Gaul*. Ashgate:

University of Michigan Press and 2012. *Poetics of Wonder: Testimonies of the New Christian Miracles in the Late Antique Latin World*. Turnhout: Brepols.

10. 1-3 *Non possum uniuersa percurrere, quae sanctorum presbyterorum litterae comprehendunt. De libellis ipsius aliqua proferam. Argumentatur contra signa atque uirtutes quae in basilicis martyrum fiunt et dicit eas incredulis prodesse, non credentibus, quasi nunc hoc quaeratur, quibus fiant, et non qua uirtute fiant.*

I am unable to run through all of the topics that the letters of the holy presbyters cover, so I will mention some from his treatises. He makes arguments against the signs and miracles that occur in the basilicas of the martyrs, and he says that they are useful for unbelievers, not believers, as if the important question to answer is for whom they occur, not by what miracle.

contra signa: Vigilantius was not alone in speaking against the use of miracles.

Augustine, for example, wrote early in his career that miracles were necessary in the distant past, but had become less so by his day (*De util. cred.* 16.34). He wrote similarly in *De uer. rel.* 25.47: *maiores nostros eo gradu fidei...uisibilia miracula (non enim aliter poterant) secutos esse: per quos id actum est, ut necessaria non essent posteris*. In his works, Jerome mentioned “*signa*” and “*uirtutes*,” referring specifically to the deeds of men in the bible; e.g. *Ep.* 60.7, 70.4, and variously in his commentaries. His preferred term is “*miracula*,” e.g. *Ep.* 53.1. To be clear, the question of how miracles were used to convert unbelievers must be kept apart from whether or not Vigilantius believed in the miracles performed by martyrs while they were alive. His stance on miracles performed by martyrs’ relics, however, had been firmly negative.

incredulis prodesse, non credentibus: Ps.-Ambrose was in line with Vigilantius as well: *in principio signa incredulis fiebant, nobis iam in plenitudine ecclesiae non signo, sed fide ueritas colligenda est* (Ps.-Amb. *De sacr.* 2.5.15). Vigilantius' problem was, as Jerome presented it, that these signs seemed little more than persuasive devices, not a true manifestation of God's power that might be useful for Christian worship.

10.4 *Esto signa sint infidelium, qui, quoniam sermoni et doctrinae credere noluerunt, signis adducantur ad fidem: et dominus incredulis signa faciebat, et tamen non idcirco domini suggillanda sunt signa, quia illi infideles erant, sed maiori admirationi erunt, quia tantae fuere potentiae, ut etiam mentes durissimas edomarent, et ad fidem cogerent.*

Let us grant that they are the signs for unbelievers who, because they were unwilling to believe in speech and doctrine, are brought to the faith through signs, and the Lord made these signs for them. Nevertheless, the signs of the Lord must not take a beating because those people were without faith; instead, they will be a source of greater admiration because their power was great enough to subdue the most stubborn minds and compel them to the faith.

adducantur...edomarent...cogerent: Jerome made his point rhetorically, showing with the passive "*adducantur*," that the unbelievers were not the focal point in an argument about miracles; it was their active and effective power that moved people.

idcirco...cogerent: This is a circular argument. Miracles were powerful only if they were realized as effective in converting stubborn unbelievers.

densissimas...edomarent: Vigilantius found unbelievers easily moved by spectacles, but Jerome countered him by cleverly calling their minds "*densissimae*," suggesting that it was difficult to convert them – more a rhetorical ploy than a valid premise.

10.5-6 *Itaque nolo mihi dicas: signa infidelium sunt, sed responde quomodo in uilissimo puluere et fauilla nescio qua tanta sit signorum uirtutumque praesentia. Sentio, sentio, infelicissime mortalium, quid doleas, quid timeas.*

Therefore, do not tell me that they are merely signs for the unbelieving; tell me instead how there is such a great presence of signs and miracles in "the vilest dust and ash, whatever it is." I sense it, I sense, you most wretched of mortals, why you are pained and what you fear.

responde...praesentia: Jerome challenged Vigilantius to account for the effects of relics. This suggests that, in spite of the polemic in the citations, Vigilantius did not argue against the power in martyrs' remains.

praesentia: For a theological argument concerning the presence of the divine in relics, see Victricius of Rouen's *De Laude Sanctorum*. For a recent translation and discussion of the theology, see Clark, G. 1999. "Victricius of Rouen : « Praising the Saints »." *JECS* 7 (3): 365-399; also, 2001. "Translating Relics: Victricius of Rouen and Fourth-Century Debate." *EME* 10 (2): 161-176.

infelicissime mortalium: This insult is rare and used by Jerome in only one other place, *Ep.* 147.4. It may have been inspired by Sulpicius Severus in *Ep.* 1.5: *Atquin uel horum exemplo omnium mortalium infelicissime perfidiam tuam coarguere ipse debueras*. In this letter, Sulpicius wrote in response to those who did not believe in the miracles performed by Martin. He also, in *Ep.* 1.1, accused the unbeliever of being influenced by an evil spirit (*malo spiritu suscitatum*), something Jerome will continue to do presently.

10.7-8 *Spiritus iste immundus qui haec te cogit scribere saepe hoc "uilissimo" tortus est "puluere," immo hodieque torquetur, et qui in te plagas dissimulat, in ceteris confitetur. Nisi forte in morem gentilium impiorumque Porphyrii et Eunomii has praestigias daemonum esse confingas et non uere clamare daemones, sed sua simulare tormenta, do consilium: ingredere basilicas martyrum et aliquando purgaberis.*

That unclean spirit which forces you to write these things has often been tortured by the same "worthless dust;" more correctly, he is still tortured today, and even though he keeps his wounds secret in you, he reveals them in others. Unless perhaps in the fashion of the heathen and wicked men, Porphyry and Eunomius, you should pretend that these are the tricks of demons: that they do not really cry out, but fake their own torments, here is some advice: enter the basilicas of the martyrs, and you will be cleansed at any time.

Spiritus...confitetur: Evil spirits and demons under torture cannot keep from confessing the power of martyrs. Ambrose discussed the phenomenon in his letter concerning the discovery of the relics of SS Protasius and Gervasius (*Ep.* 22.16). Augustine used Ambrose's letter as a

prime example of demons confessing that they were being tortured by martyrs: *ab eis se torqueri daemones in hominibus confitentur* (*De cur. ger.* 21). The difference in the case of Vigilantius was that his visiting evil spirit managed to keep his torments a secret.

tortus est: torquere is the usual verb describing the torment of evil spirits. See Mt. 8:29: [*daemones*] *clamauerunt dicentes quid nobis et tibi fili dei uenisti huc ante tempus torquere nos.*

Porphyrii: Jerome mentioned him here as a prime example of a pagan who argued that bad demons could deceive others, e.g. *De abstin.* 2.40-42. The specific context of this passage, that demons fake their own torments, is not found in Porphyry's extant works and this text is cited as a fragment concerning some of Porphyry's writings in Berchman, R.M. 2005. *Porphyry Against the Christians*. Leiden: Brill, p. 170.

Eunomii: See CV 8.5 note.

10.9 *Inuenies ibi multos socios tuos et nequaquam cereis martyrum, qui tibi displicent, sed flammis inuisibilibus combureris, et tunc fateberis, quod nunc negas, et tuum nomen, qui in Vigilantio loqueris, libere proclamabis: te esse aut Mercurium propter nummorum cupiditatem aut Nocturnum iuxta Plauti Amphitryonem, quo dormiente in Alcmenae adulterio, duas noctes Iuppiter copulauit, ut magnae fortitudinis hercules nasceretur aut certe Liberum patrem pro ebrietate et cantharo ex humeris dependente et semper rubente facie et spumantibus labiis effrenatisque conuiciis.*

There, you will find many of your associates and you will be set ablaze not by the candles of the martyrs, which displease you, but by invisible flames. Then, you will confess what you now deny, and you will freely proclaim your name, you who speak within Vigilantius. You will proclaim that you are either Mercury on account of your desire for money, or Nocturnus, from Plautus' *Amphitryon*, for while he was sleeping, Jupiter had sex with his wife, Alcmena, for two nights, resulting in the birth of powerful Hercules. Or, you are Father Liber, of course, because of his drunkenness and the flask that hung from his shoulders; he was always red-faced, foaming at the mouth, and full of irrepressible insults.

Mercurium: Mercury was associated with trade and merchants and often depicted with a purse, descriptions ranging from "lucri repertor" (*CIL* 6.520) to a thief, especially among Christian authors; e.g. Arn. *Adv. Nat.* 4.24, Aug. *CD* 7.26. For more on Mercury, see *LIMC* 6.1.500-37 and Combet-Farnoux, B. 1980. *Mercure romain: Le culte public de Mercure et la*

function mercantile à Rome de la république archaïque à l'époque augustéenne. Rome: Ecole française de Rome. Vigilantius' greed has not yet been specifically discussed, although Jerome has depicted him enjoying a lavish lifestyle. Any clergyman drawn to money is a sham; see, for example, *Ep.* 52.5 and *Ambr. De off.* 2.66.

Nocturnum: By tying his enemy to this god Jerome was able to make a many-layered joke. First, he was able to make fun of Vigilantius' name once again. Furthermore, Vigilantius' complaint against vigils was lampooned, as Nocturnus was cuckolded after he fell asleep because he was too drunk (272: *Nocturnum obdormiuisse ebrium*). Even the mention of Hercules calls to mind the introductory chapter of this treatise. The only drawback is that it also shows, as Vigilantius noted, how women might commit adultery instead of going to sleep at night. Of course, if Nocturnus had practiced vigils, Alcmene might never have had her affair. For a convincing argument that Nocturnus was an epithet for Liber, see Stewart, Z. 1960. "The God Nocturnus in Plautus' *Amphitruo*." *JRS* 50: 37-43.

Liberum: Father Liber, the Roman version of Dionysos, suited Jerome's caricature of Vigilantius, being closely associated with wine. The *cantharus* was often included in depictions of him; e.g. *Plin. NH* 33.11.53, *Arn. Adv. Nat.* 6.25. For depictions of Dionysos, see *LIMC* 3.414-514; for Bacchus, see *LIMC* 3.540-60.

effrenatique conuiciis: The vivid phrase, "uncontrolled abuse," which appears two more times in Jerome's works (*Comm. Ad Tit.* and *Comm. in Mich.* 1.4), was from *Cypr. De zel.* 8, where he described the appearance of a jealous or envious person: *Hinc uultus minax, toruus aspectus, pallor in facie, in labiis tremor, stridor in dentibus, uerba rabida, effrenata conuicia.*

Chapter XI

In this section, Jerome interrupted his refutation of Vigilantius' works by sharing a moment embarrassing for Vigilantius that occurred years earlier when the two met in Bethlehem.

11.1-3 *Unde et in hac prouincia cum subitus terrae motus noctis medio omnes de somno excitasset, tu prudentissimus et sapientissimus mortalium nudus orabas, et referebas nobis Adam et Euam de paradiso. Et illi quidem apertis oculis erubuerunt nudos se esse cernentes et uerenda texerunt arborum foliis: tu et tunica et fide nudus subitoque timore perterritus et aliquid habens nocturnae crapulae, sanctorum oculis obscenam partem corporis ingerebas ut tuam indicares prudentiam. Tales habet aduersarios ecclesia: hi duces contra martyrum sanguinem dimicant, huiuscemodi oratores contra apostolos pertonant, imo tam rabidi canes contra Christi latrant discipulos.*

And at one time, in this province, a sudden earthquake in the middle of the night roused everyone from sleep; you, most sensible and wisest of mortals, were praying in the nude - you were clearly reenacting Adam and Eve from Paradise. They, upon opening their eyes, blushed when they saw that they were naked and covered their shameful parts with tree leaves. You, however, with no tunic and no faith, suddenly froze in fear and still exhibiting signs of the night's drinking binge, you were forcing the indecent part of your body upon the holy men's eyes in order to reveal your sense of discretion. Such are the adversaries of the church! These generals fight against the blood of the martyrs; orators of this sort bellow against the apostles; or, rather, such are the rabid dogs that bark against Christ's disciples.

terrae motus: This incident might have been the embarrassing incident that Jerome refused to discuss in his letter to Paulinus, *Ep.* 58.11. See, e.g. (Lössl, "Early Christian," 97-116). For a catalogue of earthquakes in the ancient Mediterranean, see Capelle, W. 1924. "Erdbebenforschung." *Paulys Realencyclopädie* Suppl. 4:344-74. The earthquake to which Jerome refers here is not listed.

prudentissimus et sapientissimus: Perhaps hearkening back ironically to Cic. *De off.* 1.15.6: *quique acutissime et celerrime potest et uidere et explicare rationem is prudentissimus et sapientissimus rite haberi solet.*

nudus orabas: For the question of whether it was customary for the ancients to sleep in the nude, see Adkin, N. 2000. "Did the Romans Keep Their Underwear on in Bed?" *CW* 93: 619-20; also Olson, K. 2003. "Roman Underwear Revisited." *CW* 96: 201-210. Adkin argued that

this particular passage from the *CV* proved that Romans did not wear some form of clothing at night. He wrote that, “Jerome merely rebukes Vigilantius for neglecting to don his tunic; he does not upbraid his fellow priest for failure to retain any underclothing at all” (620). The passage does not fully support his reading; the fact that Jerome described Vigilantius praying nude with the ponderous superlatives *prudenter et sapienter mortalium* indicates some criticism of the practice. Olson did not disagree with Adkin, suggesting only that the *tunica* in the passage was probably a *camisia*, a tunic-like pajama (210), which supports the suggestion that Vigilantius should have been wearing some form of sleepwear.

et tunica et fide nudus: Zeugma.

crapulae: Jerome could not resist adding a reminder that Vigilantius overindulged in wine, as well as referring to *CV* 3.3 (see note).

obscenam partem corporis: This euphemism can be found in other authors of the period; e.g. Aug. *CD* 14.16, *ibid. De dial.* 7, Lact. *De opif.* 7.7.

tales...discipulos: Vigilantius had already been called a “*canis uiuens*” in *CV* 6.9. The parallel structures of the verb-final clauses *dimicant...pertinent* are nicely thrown off-balance with the final and deliberately bathetic clause; Vigilantius and his allies could not be compared to leaders and orators, they are merely barking dogs. The *uariatio*, while stylistically reason enough for the structure, is perhaps secondary to the care with which Jerome maintained the rhythm of these three clauses, each exhibiting a *cursus tardus* (/ x x / x x). For the *cursus* in Jerome, see Ch. 1, pp. 13-15.

pertinent: A Late Latin word; *TLL* s.v. 1813. Jerome used this verb rather often, usually to capture the grandness of God’s voice (e.g. *Adv. Hel.* 20).

Chapter XII

In this section, Jerome explained his fear of God's heightened presence near martyrs' remains and wrote defensively about his own behavior. His own guilt weighed heavily on his mind, as was evident in his famous dream wherein he was on trial for being a Ciceronian and not a Christian (*Ep.* 22.30).

12.1-2 *Ego confiteor timorem meum, ne forsitan de superstitione descendat. Quando iratus fuero et aliquid mali in meo animo cogitauero et me nocturnum phantasma deluserit, basilicas martyrum intrare non audeo.*

I confess my fear so that it not seem to stem from any superstition. Whenever I am angry, and think something evil in my mind, and a spirit deceives me during the night, I do not dare to enter the basilicas of the martyrs.

phantasma: *TLL* s.v. 2006.75 for the term pertaining to dream visions. For Augustine's use of the term to mean "dream," see Dulaey, M. 1973. *Le rêve dans la vie et la pensée de saint Augustin*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, pp. 93-96. For dreams in general, see Harris, W.V. 2009. *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 66-76.

deluserit: Cf. Verg. *Aen.* 10.642: *quae sopitos deludent somnia sensus*. In this passage, Juno, fearing for Turnus, sent a shade in the guise of Aeneas to trick Turnus into leaving the battle. Jerome already blamed spirits for Vigilantius' un-Christian behavior and explained his anger here in the same way, as being deceived by an evil demon. For pagan gods as demons, see, for example, Just. Mart. *1 Apol.* 9, Tert. *De spect.* 8.7, 8.9; Lact. *Inst.* 2.14-16. Thus, since evil spirits howled at the proximity of the holy relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy (*CV* 5.10), Jerome feared that, if he had a guilty conscience, his spirit would react similarly to the presence of martyrs' remains. Augustine, too, wrote of the behavior of evil spirits: *fallacium*

malignorumque spirituum, qui extrinsecus in animam ueniunt, humanosque sensus sopitos uigilantesue deludunt (CD 10.11).

12.3-4 *Ita totus et animo et corpore pertremesco. Rideas forsitan et muliercularum deliramenta subsannes.*

In much the same way, I tremble all over in my body and mind. You may laugh, perhaps, and you may grin at these thoughts as women's nonsense.

pertremesco: A later Latin word, used more frequently by Jerome than other authors, often to describe one's reaction to god's power, e.g. *Comm. in Dan. 2.7: peccatores tormentorum magnitudinem pertremiscant*; *TLL* s.v. 1823.6-23.

muliercularum: See CV 3.5 for a note on *mulierculae*.

deliramenta: While he imagined that Vigilantius considered a just fear of god's power "deliramenta," Jerome used the term for apocryphal texts; e.g. *Adv. Hel. 8, Apol. adv. Ruf. 2.25, Comm. in Ez. 13.44*, etc.

12.5-6 *Non erubescio earum fidem, quae primae uiderunt dominum resurgentem, quae mittuntur ad apostolos, quae in matre domini saluatoris sanctis apostolis commendantur. Tu ructato cum saeculi hominibus, ego ieiunabo cum feminis, immo cum religiosis uiris, qui pudicitiam uultu praeferunt et pallida iugi continentia ora portantes, Christi ostendunt uerecundiam.*

I am not ashamed of the faith of these women who first saw the risen Lord, who were sent to the apostles, who, in the mother of the Lord, Savior, were commended to the holy apostles. Go and belch with your secular men; I will fast with women, nay, with religious men who display their chastity in their faces, and, their cheeks pale from constant abstinence, reveal the modesty of Christ.

earum fidem...commendantur: Jerome was referring to Lk 24:1-12 and the women who were chosen to relate the news of Jesus' resurrection. They were afraid, (Lk 24:5) but maintained their faith.

ructato: See note on CV 1.9.

ieiunabo: Jerome's attitude towards fasting was favorable, although the degree he recommended changed throughout his career as an ascetic advisor; after Blesilla's death, for

example, Jerome was censured for encouraging the young woman to persevere in her extreme ascetic lifestyle (*Ep.* 39; for his relationship with Blessilla and other women, see Kelly, *Jerome*, 91-103). See Grimm, V.E. 1996. *From Feasting to Fasting: The Evolution of a Sin*. London: Routledge, pp. 148-68. Extreme fasting, however, was not encouraged by Jerome's contemporaries. Basil of Caesarea spoke against consumption of post-lapsarian food such as wine and meat but did not recommend extreme fasting (*De iei.* 1-2); Ambrose, too, advocated sensible fasting (*De off.* 2.122; 3.10); Jovinian argued that abstinence from food contradicted what was written in the bible (*AJ* passim). *AJ* 2.5 is useful for Jerome's responses to Jovinian's propositions on fasting.

The duration of fasts had also been in dispute, at least from the time of the Council of Elvira, which was convened at the start of the 4th century. Canon 26 states:

Errorem placuit corrigi, ut omni sabbati die superpositiones celebremus.

The mistake must be corrected that we celebrate extensions of the fast every Saturday. Just as Vigilantius worried that Easter was celebrated too often, the people at this council also shared similar concerns about fasting too often.

feminis...uiris: Jerome elsewhere described how faith made women and men one in gender. For example, in *Ep.* 75.2, he consoled Theodora by recalling the pure Christian love that existed between her and her deceased husband, Lucinius: *in terra quoque sororem te habere coeperat, immo fratrem; quia casta coniunctio sexum non habet nuptialem*. For more on the transformation of women into men, see Feichtinger, B. 1995. *Apostolae Apostolorum: Frauenaskese als Befreiung und Zwang bei Hieronymus*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, p.163.

pallida iugi continentia ora portantes: A pale face is visible evidence of continence and devotion to an ascetic lifestyle, especially among women. Jerome remarked on paleness several

times. See Adkin , *Jerome*, 62 on *Ep.* 22.7; he also incorrectly attributes the comparison to *CV* 13. Further in *Ep.* 22.13, Jerome stated that Romans equated fasting and paleness with Manichaeism; Jerome was himself attacked for looking too pale (*Ep.* 45.2) and was later accused of being Manichee (*Ep.* 48.2-3 and *AJ* 1.3, 5). See Hunter, D. "Resistance to the Virginal Ideal in Late Fourth-Century Rome: the Case of Jovinian." *ThSt* 48: 45-64. In keeping with the tone of the chapter, praising his own pallor was a defensive move, introduced wittily with “*non erubesco.*”

pudicitiam...praeferunt...ostendunt uerecundiam: Chiasmus and homoeoteleuton.

Chapter XIII

Returning to his task of refuting Vigilantius, Jerome defends sending alms to the Holy Land.

13.1 *Videris mihi dolere et aliud, ne, si inoleuerit apud Gallos continentia et sobrietas atque ieiunium, tabernae tuae lucra non habeant et uigilias diaboli ac temulenta conuiuia tota nocte exercere non possis.*

It seems to me that you are troubled by something else. You fear that if continence, sobriety, and fasting should take root among the people of Gaul, then your taverns would start to lose revenue and you would no longer be able to practice the devil's vigils and your drunken parties every night.

inoleuerit apud Gallos: *Inolescere* with the preposition *apud* is uncommon and Jerome has only used it twice in his works, here and in *Ad Gal.* 3.5.26: *apud nostros error inoleuit*. The verb is apt, describing what happens for the worse; *TLL* s.v. 1739.13-47.

13.2 *Praeterea eisdem ad me relatum est epistulis quod contra auctoritatem apostoli Pauli, immo Petri, Iohannis et Iacobi, qui dexteris dederunt Paulo et Barnabae communicationis et praeceperunt eis ut pauperum memores essent, tu prohibeas Hierosolymam in usus sanctorum aliqua sumptuum solacia dirigi.*

In addition, I have been informed in the same letters that you were in opposition to the authority of Paul, or, rather, Peter, John, and Jacob, who have given the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas, and who commanded them to be mindful of the poor. Instead, I hear that you are preventing any financial relief from being sent to Jerusalem to assist the saints.

Pauli...essent: Gal. 2:9-10. Whatever was reported to Jerome is soon contradicted; Vigilantius did not protest being mindful of the poor. See below.

tu prohibeas Hierosolymam: Vigilantius had not minded sending money ten years ago (Stancliffe, *Martin*, 301-5). He in fact first met Jerome when he was a courier, bearing alms from Paulinus.

13.3 *Videlicet si ad haec respondero, statim latrabis meam me causam agere, qui tanta cunctos largitate donasti, ut, nisi uenisses Hierosolymam et tuas uel patronorum tuorum pecunias effudisses, omnes periclitaremur fame.*

Of course, if I respond to these things, you will immediately start yapping that I am pleading my own case; for you were so generous to everyone that, if you had not come to Jerusalem and opened your wallet or that of your patrons, we would all have wasted away from starvation.

latrabis: Cf. CV 11.3.

meam...agere: Cf. *Ep.* 79.2ff. in which Jerome wrote to Salvina about how generous her deceased husband, Nebridius, had been with his possessions. Salvina, *PLRE* 1.799. Of course, Jerome's views on almsgiving were not shared by all. Compare, for example, Salvian's moderate stance: *Numquid enim aut omnes mali in terra corporales thesauros suos aut omnes boni in caelo locant? Non utique...* (*Ad Ecc.* 1.2.8.).

Videlicet...fame: Jerome, anticipating Vigilantius' reaction, used the opportunity to add another sarcastic comment, that Vigilantius had sent others' money and not his own; however, he also included Vigilantius' patrons, suggesting that he was also no longer in a friendly relationship with them. Paulinus, for example, was a patron who had sent alms to Jerome through Vigilantius ten years earlier (*Ep.* 61.3). Some time after 396, Paulinus and Jerome parted ways.

13.4 *Ego hoc loquor quod beatus apostolus Paulus in cunctis paene epistulis suis loquitur et praecepit: in ecclesiis gentium per unam sabbati, hoc est die dominico, omnes conferre debere quae Hierosolymam in sanctorum solacia dirigantur, et uel per discipulos suos uel per quos ipsi probauerint, et, si dignum fuerit, ipse aut dirigat aut perferat quod collectum est.*

I am saying what the blessed Apostle Paul says and advises in nearly all of his Epistles; he gives a request to the churches of his people that, on the first day of the Sabbath, that is, the day of the Lord, everyone ought to contribute to what will be sent to Jerusalem for the relief of the saints, either through his disciples, or through those of whom they themselves approve; and if it be appropriate, he should send it himself, or carry what was collected.

Hierosolymam: 1 Cor. 16:1-4. Elsewhere, Paul also wrote about sending relief to the Holy Land, e.g. Rom. 15:25-26.

13.5-6 *In Actibus quoque apostolorum loquens ad Felicem praesidem: Post annos, ait, plures elemosynas facturus in gentem meam ueni, et oblationes et uota in quibus inuenerunt me purificatum in templo. Numquid in alia parte terrarum et in his ecclesiis quas nascentes fide sua erudiebat, quae ab aliis acceperat diuidere non poterat?*

Also, in the Acts of the Apostles, addressing Felix, the governor, he said, "After many years, I came to Jerusalem to give alms to my people as well as offerings and vows, during which they found me purified in the temple." Why, could he not distribute what he had received from others

in another part of the world and the churches that, in their nascent stage, he was teaching in the manner of his own faith?

Actibus: Acts 24:17-18.

ad Felicem praesidem: According to Josephus, Felix was sent to Judaea as governor by Claudius in 52 (JA 20.137; JW 2.247.).

Numquid...poterat: The focal point of this sentence is Paul's authority. As the main historical proponent of and overseer of the distribution of alms, Paul's decision to help the people of Jerusalem had long been established and was not to be challenged by Vigilantius.

13.7-8 *Sed sanctis pauperibus dare cupiebat, qui suas pro Christo facultatulas relinquentes ad Domini seruitutem tota mente conuersi sunt. Longum est nunc si de cunctis epistulis eius omnia testimonia reuoluere uoluero in quibus hoc agit et tota mente festinat, ut Hierosolimam et ad sancta loca credentibus pecuniae dirigantur, non in auaritiam, sed in refrigerium, non ad diuitias congregandas, sed ad imbecillitatem corpusculi sustentandam et frigus atque inediam declinandam; hac in Iudaea usque hodie perseuerante consuetudine, non solum apud nos, sed etiam apud Hebraeos, ut, qui in lege Domini meditantur die ac nocte et patrem non habent in terra nisi solum deum synagogarum et totius orbis foueantur ministeriis, ex aequalitate dumtaxat, non ut aliis refrigerium et aliis sit tribulatio, sed ut aliorum abundantia aliorum sustentet inopiam.*

But he desired to provide for the holy poor who abandoned their meager possessions for Christ's sake and turned to serving God with all their hearts. It would be no brief task if I were willing to recite all of the passages from the collection of his letters in which he makes his case and presses enthusiastically that money be sent to Jerusalem and the holy places for believers. This is to be accomplished not for greed, but for refreshment; not for gathering riches, but for supporting the weakness of the infirm body and to reduce cold and hunger. This custom continues in Judaea, even to the present day, not only with us, but with the Hebrews, so that they, who meditate upon the Lord day and night and do not have a father in their land save for God alone, may be nourished by the help of the synagogues and of the whole world; that, for equality's sake, there may not be refreshment for some and hardship for others, but that the abundance of some may help the need of others.

Longum...inopiam: The length of the sentence is a fine showcase of Jerome's ability to craft a syntactically complicated, yet perfectly clear and balanced sentence. Ultimately, the balanced construction of the sentence served Jerome's concluding message preaching fairness and equity.

non in auaritiam: Note the *uariatio* of parallel antithetical clauses: *non in auaritiam...sed in refrigerium; non ad diuitias...sed ad imbecillitatem; non solum apud nos...sed etiam apud Hebraeos; non ut...sed ut*, reminiscent of Rm. 13:13. Of course, not all churchgoers agreed to give alms without questioning how the money would be used; e.g. John Chrys. *Hom. in 1 Cor.* 21.6.

reuoluere uoluero: This particular *parachesis*, where similar sounds are repeated in close succession, is used elsewhere by Jerome in *Ep.* 79.4 and *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 1.16. This rhetorical device is sometimes inspired by Cicero; see Cain, A. 2013. *Jerome and the Monastic Clergy: A Commentary on Letter 52 to Nepotian, with an Introduction, Text, and Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 92-93.

tota mente: This phrase may be approaching an adverb. For a thorough treatment of adjectives + *-mente* in both Classical and Christian Latin, see Karlsson, K.E. 1981. *Syntax and Affixation: The Evolution of MENTE in Latin and Romance*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 135-43 in particular.

in Iudaea: For Jewish almsgiving, see Deut. 14:28-29. For charity in Christianity, see Bolkestein, H. 1939. *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*. Utrecht: A. Oosthoek. See also *DACL* 3.1.598-653.

in lege...nocte: Ps. 1:2: *in lege eius meditabitur die ac nocte*. This verse was a clear favorite, appearing nearly 30 times throughout Jerome's works.

non ut aliis...inopiam: A reworded citation of 2 Cor. 8.13-14: *non enim ut aliis sit remissio uobis autem tribulatio sed ex aequalitate; in praesenti tempore uestra abundantia illorum inopiam suppleat ut et illorum abundantia uestrae inopiae sit supplementum*. See Jer. *Epp.* 108.15 and 120.1 for the similar use of *refrigerium* instead of *remissio*.

Chapter XIV

Jerome continued his defense of sending alms to the East. However, he did not fully address Vigilantius' objection that the financially poor in Jerusalem were no more needy than those in Gaul.

14.1-2 *Respondebis hoc unumquemque in patria sua posse facere nec pauperes defuturos, qui ecclesiae opibus sustentandi sint. Nec nos negamus cunctis pauperibus etiam Iudaeis et Samaritanis, si tanta sit largitas, stipes porrigendas; sed apostolus docet faciendam quidem ad omnes elemosynam, sed maxime ad domesticos fidei.*

You will respond that any person can do this in his own land and that there will be no lack of poor people to be supported by the resources of the Church. We do not deny that small offerings ought to be extended to all the poor, even the Jews and the Samaritans, if there were such a great bounty. But the Apostle teaches that we must give alms to everyone, but especially to those of our faith.

in patria sua: While a verbatim citation is lacking, Jerome earlier paraphrased Vigilantius' disapproval of sending alms to the Holy Land (CV 13.2). Vigilantius must have wanted the money to be distributed locally. See further on CV 15.1.

pauperes defuturos: Mt 26:11.

etiam Iudaeis et Samaritanis: Jerome generously included these groups in his list to show to what extent he subscribed to Paul's message. Elsewhere he likened heretics to Samaritans, Vigilantius included (Ep. 109.1). See also his *Comm. in Am.* 2.4.1.

maxime ad domesticos fidei: Gal. 6:10. What Paul preached was not specifically about almsgiving: *ergo dum tempus habemus operemur bonum ad omnes maxime autem ad domesticos fidei.*

14.3-4 *De quibus et Saluator in Euangelio loquebatur: Facite uobis amicos de iniquo mammona, qui uos recipiant in aeterna tabernacula. Numquid et isti pauperes, inter quorum pannos et illuuiem corporis flagrans libido dominatur, possunt habere aeterna tabernacula, qui nec praesentia possident nec futura?*

The Savior speaks of them in the Gospel: "Make for yourselves friends from the mammon of iniquity, so that they may receive you into the everlasting abodes." As for those poor people,

with their tattered clothes and filthy bodies, whom a raging lust dominates - are they able to have everlasting abodes even though they possess neither present nor future prospects?

isti pauperes: The problem, for Jerome, was that money might be distributed amongst the wrong poor people. That a person lacked money was not reason enough to donate all local funds thereby preventing any from being sent to Jerusalem, where, presumably, all would be worthy recipients; see below on *pauperes spiritu*.

aeterna tabernacula: For Jerome's role in the developing theology of surrogate almsgiving and mitigation in the afterlife, see Shanzer, D. 2009. "Jerome, Tobit, Alms, and the *Vita Aeterna*," in Cain, A. and J. Lössl, eds., pp. 88-9.

14.5-6 *Non enim simpliciter pauperes, sed pauperes spiritu beati appellantur, de quibus scriptum est: Beatus qui intellegit super egenum et pauperem: in die mala liberabit eum Dominus. In uulgi pauperibus sustentandis nequaquam intellectu, sed eleemosyna opus est.*

It is not simply the poor, but the poor in spirit who are called blessed. Of them it is written: "*Blessed is he who gives thought to the poor and the needy: on the evil day, the Lord will deliver him.*" In aiding the poor of the common people, understanding is not what is needed, but rather, alms.

pauperes spiritu: Jerome subdivided the definition of "poor," taking the phrase from Mt. 5:3: *beati pauperes spiritu quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum*. Financial poverty and spiritual poverty differ greatly and "blessed" refer to ascetics who chose poverty, preferring a life with God to material goods. Cf. Bas. Caes. *Hom. in Ps.* 33.5. To Jerome, Vigilantius would help the common poor at the expense of helping poor ascetics.

Beatus...Dominus: Ps. 40:1.

14.7-8 *In sanctis pauperibus beatitudo est intelligentiae ut ei tribuatur, qui erubescit accipere, et, cum acceperit, dolet, metens carnalia et seminans spiritalia. Quod autem adserit melius eos facere, qui utantur rebus suis et paulatim fructus possessionum pauperibus diuidant, quam illos, qui possessionibus uenundatis semel omnia largiantur, non a me ei, sed a Domino respondebitur: Si uis esse perfectus, uade, uende omnia quae habes et da pauperibus et ueni sequere me.*

In the case of the holy poor, there is a blessed understanding that it be given to one who blushes when receiving and grieves once he has received, reaping material things while sowing spiritual things. Moreover, as to his assertion that the people who enjoy their own goods and divide the fruits of their possessions little by little with the poor are acting better than those who sell all of their possessions and give them all away at once, not I, but the Lord will respond: “*If you wish to be perfect, come, sell all that you have, and give to the poor: come, follow me.*”

sanctis pauperibus: That is, Christian ascetics, the *pauperes spiritu*. The *sancti pauperes* are to be distinguished from the *isti pauperes* described in 14.6, because, as he writes in *Comm. in Mich.* 1.3: *sancti autem pauperes, hi erant in Hierusalem, qui primum in Christo crediderant de Iudaeis*. The concept of the “*sancti pauperes*” goes back to Rom. 15:26. To confess to holy poverty is considered the same as confessing one’s Christianity in Aug. *CD* 1.10.

beatitudo est intelligentiae: Or, *beata intelligentia*. For the increasingly common *genitiuus inuersus* in later Latin, see *LHS* 2.152.

tribuatur: The present author’s emendation from Feiertag’s *tribuat*, which makes no grammatical sense. Cf. Mt. 25:29 *omni enim habenti dabitur et abundabit ei autem qui non habet et quod uidetur habere auferetur ab eo*.

metens carnalia et seminans spiritalia: The construction follows Behaghel’s Law (see *CV* 1.6) and paraphrases 1 Cor. 9:11: *si nos uobis spiritalia seminauimus magnum est si nos carnalia uestra metamus?*

melius...largiantur: Vigilantius was not alone in believing that there were different and accepted degrees of giving to the church. Augustine, for instance, wrote that Christ’s instruction was not to sell unquestioningly all one’s possessions; rather, citing 1 Tim. 6:17-19, he continued in *Ep.* 157.26:

Ista superbia diuitem illum qui iacentem ante ianuam suam contemnebat pauperem iustum, et ista spes in incerto diuitiarum... non ipsae diuitiae perduxerunt ad inferni tormenta.

Not the riches themselves, but that pride and that hope in uncertain wealth led the rich man, who looked down upon the righteous poor man lying in front of his door, to the place of torment.

The issue was less about the understanding of the receiver, but rather the giver. 1 Tim. is one of Augustine's favorite verses, cited over fifty times, while only twice in Jerome; the first, a reference to the passage in his *Comm. ad Gal.* 3; the second, a conciliatory remark to Salvina concerning the charitable deeds of her recently deceased husband, Nebridius (*Jer. Ep.* 79.3.). In that instance, however, Jerome described Nebridius' actions positively, excusing the fact that he did not sell all that he had. Of course, his motivations for writing that letter were quite different, namely to secure Salvina's good will and generosity.

Si uis...me: Mt. 19.21. This verse does not address the core of Vigilantius' objection. Vigilantius did not state that these instructions must be ignored altogether. The paraphrase merely demonstrated his concerns about the welfare of local churches and their communities. Not everyone could be a monk, and Vigilantius knew this; judging from the more flexible outlook in *Ep.* 79 and elsewhere, so did Jerome. Cf., for example, *Ep.* 54.12, written to a widow named Furia:

Illis tribue diuitias tuas, qui non Phasides aues, sed cibarium panem comedant; qui famem expellat, non qui augeat luxuriam. Intellige super egenum et pauperem. Omni petenti te, da; sed maxime domesticis fidei.

He even said as much in what follows. The only problem was that he did not agree that they agreed on this issue. For other instances in which the two presbyters seemed to agree, see Lössl, "Early Christian," 97-116.

14.9-10 *Ad eum loquitur qui uult esse perfectus, qui cum apostolis patrem, nauiculam et rete dimittit. Iste quem tu laudas secundus aut tertius gradus est; quem et nos recipimus, dummodo sciamus prima secundis et tertiis praeferenda.*

He speaks to the one who wishes to be perfect, who, with the apostles, leaves his father, ship, and net. The man whom you praise is of second or third tier. We still receive him so long as we understand that the first is preferred to the second, the second to the third.

patrem...dimittit: Mt. 4:22.

Iste...praeferenda: Again, Jerome argued against a point with which Vigilantius would probably agree. Jerome also wrote about a three-tiered hierarchy, the sower parable of Mt. 13, with regard to the ranking of virgins, widows, and the married; e.g. *Ep.* 22.15, *AJ* 1.3 (which he cites in *Ep.* 48.2), *Ep.* 66.2.

Chapter XV

15.1 *Nec a suo studio monachi deterrendi sunt ad elinguis uiperæ morsus saeuissimos, quibus argumentatur et dicit: SI OMNES SE RECLAUSERINT ET FUERINT IN SOLITUDINE, QUIS CELEBRABIT ECCLESIAS, QUIS SAECULARES HOMINES LUCRIFACIET, QUIS PECCANTES AD VIRTUTES POTERIT COHORTARI?*

Monks must not be deterred from their pursuits to respond to an inarticulate viper that, with the most savage bites, makes his case and says: “If everyone closed himself off and remained in the wilderness, who will fill the churches? Who will convert secular men? Who will be able to encourage sinners to virtue?”

monachi: The term μοναχός or *monachus* was the regular term for “monk” in the fourth and fifth centuries, the first instance in an early fourth century papyrus. See Morard, F. -E. 1973. “Monachos, Moine. Histoire du terme grec jusqu' au 4e siècle. Influences bibliques et gnostiques.” *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 20: 332-411. For Jerome’s writings encouraging certain individuals to lead a monastic lifestyle, see *Epp.* 52 and 125. In the latter letter, addressing a young man named Rusticus, Jerome acknowledged that, “*Non est humilitatis meae neque mensurae iudicare de ceteris et de ministris ecclesiarum sinistrum quippiam dicere. Habeant illi ordinem et gradum suum...*” Nor would Vigilantius have disagreed.

celebrabit ecclesias: Cf. CV 14.1. Vigilantius was concerned about the church becoming decentralized not only in terms of money, but worship as well. This concern made him an atypical heretic: contemporary heretics were often accused of worshiping outside the church, appearing to hide and lurk in more remote places; e.g. Ambr. *Luc.* 7.31. Ambrose accused Ursinus, a failed episcopal candidate, of meeting with Arians in their homes, suggesting that the act of seclusion was, in itself, a form of “separatist heresy” (*Ep. extra coll.* 5[11].3). See also Bowes, K. 2008. *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 193. In addition, this citation is possible evidence

that Vigilantius may have opposed Priscillianism, as there is evidence that Priscillian and his followers moved their worship away from their local churches and retreated into the mountains. See Chadwick, *Priscilian*, 9; Bowes, “*Nec sedere*,” 323-48; Brown, P. 2012. *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp.211ff. See also Stancliffe, *Martin*, 289-311 who suggested that the development of Primuliacum, which became a separate hub where monks and other Christians gathered and worshiped, led to the end of Vigilantius’ and Sulpicius’ relationship. Legal and conciliar decrees also attest to the anti-private sentiment spreading against heretical groups. For example, Eunomians were forbidden to build their own churches; some of the canons from the Council of Zaragoza forbade members from worshipping outside of the church as well. E.g. *CTh* 16.5.8: *Nullum Eunomianorum atque Arrianorum uel ex dogmate Aeti in ciuitate uel agris fabricandarum ecclesiarum copiam habere praecipimus. Quod si temere ab aliquot id praesumptum sit, domus eadem, ubi haec constructa fuerint, quae construe prohibentur, fundus etiam uel priuata possession protinus fasci nostril uiribus uindicetur...*; Council of Zaragoza, c. 2 (Mansi 3.634): *nec habitant latibula cubiculorum, ac montium...et ad alienas uillas agendorum conuentuum causa nonconueniant*. For more on “estate Christianity,” see Bowes, *Private Worship*, 161-188.

Si...cohortari: A reduction *ad absurdum*. Vigilantius’ questions do not suggest that he was against *any individual* withdrawing to the desert; he was only concerned about what would happen if *everyone* did. Yet, the rhetoric leaves room for Jerome to attack in a similar fashion (see the following).

Although Jerome considered him “*elinguis*,” this citation exhibits Vigilantius’ rhetorical style (cf. CV 4.7). The opening conditional is framed chiastically and is followed by an increasing anaphoric tricolon (*quis...quis...quis*) with *uariatio* in the placement of each verb.

15.2-3 *Hoc enim modo si omnes tecum fatui sint, sapiens esse quis poterit? Et uirginitas non erit approbanda, si enim omnes uirgines fuerint, nuptiae non erunt, interibit humanum genus, infantes in cunis non uagient, obstetrices absque mercedibus mendicabunt et grauissimo frigore solus atque contractus Dormitantius uigilabit in lectulo.*

In the same way, if everyone were dim-witted along with you, who would be able to be wise? Also, virginity will not have to be endorsed; for if everyone were a virgin, there will be no marriages: the human race will perish, children will not wail in their cradles; midwives will go begging without their wages, and Dormitantius, alone and shriveled from the severe cold, will lie awake in his little bed.

Si enim...lectulo: This *reductio ad absurdum* was used effectively to show the flaw of Vigilantius’ rhetorical questions. Jerome suggested that what drove Vigilantius was a desire to protect his personal interests.

infantes...uagient: Surely no loss for Jerome. See above on CV 2.1.

grauissimo frigore: In the grim vision of Vigilantius’ future, if everyone were to become a virgin, he would be overcome with cold. See Cain, *Letter 52*. In describing the ancients’ thoughts on physical changes in body temperature, he offered this relevant passage from Servius’ scholium on Verg. *Georg.* 2.484: *secundum physicos, qui dicunt stultos esse homines frigidioris sanguinis, prudentes calidi, unde et senes, in quibus iam friget, et pueri in quibus necdum calet, minus sapient* (75). Jerome elsewhere discussed the same physical change when he praised an elderly man in *Ep.* 10.2: *non calidi acumen ingenii frigidus sanguis obtundit*. Naturally, it would also be difficult for any man to remain warm in bed if he did not wear any clothes (CV 11)!

15.4-6 *Rara est uirtus nec a pluribus appetitur. Atque utinam hoc omnes essent quod pauci sunt, de quibus dicitur: Multi uocati, pauci electi, et uacui essent carceres. Monachus autem non doctoris habet, sed plangentis officium, qui uel se uel mundum lugeat et Domini pauidus praestoletur aduentum, qui sciens imbecillitatem suam et uas fragile quod portat, timet offendere, ne impingat et corruat atque frangatur.*

Virtue is rare and is not sought by most people. If only everyone could be what the few are, about whom it is written: “Many are called, few are chosen,” and that the prisons were empty. Moreover, the monk does not have the duty of a teacher, but of a lamenter who either grieves for himself or the world, and fearful of the Lord waits for his coming. He also knows his own weakness, and he is afraid to stumble, lest he strike the fragile vessel he is carrying and it drop and break.

Rara...appetitur: Jerome repeated this statement most closely in his *Comm. in Ez.* 10.32: *semper enim uirtus rara est, et: arta et angusta uia est quae ducit ad uitam, et pauci sunt qui ingrediuntur per eam*, and goes back to Mt. 7.14: *quam angusta porta et arta uia quae ducit ad uitam et pauci sunt qui inueniunt eam*. Cf. also Cic. *De fin.* 2.25.81: *in omni enim arte uel studio uel quauis scientia uel in ipsa uirtute optimum quidque rarissimum est*.

Monachus...officium: This was not entirely the case for Jerome, who often took great care to provide counsel and to teach those who wished to understand Scripture; e.g. *Epp.* 52, 121.

Multi...electi: Mt. 22.14. Writing against Jovinian, Jerome discussed the difficulty of the decision to be a virgin in similar terms: *noli metuere ne omnes uirgines fiant; difficilis res est uirginitas, et ideo rara, quia difficilis: multi uocati, pauci electi* (AJ 1.36.).

sciens imbecillitatem: Following the example of Christ, *scientem infirmitatem*, Is. 53:3.

uas fragile: See note on 4.4. But cf. Wis. 15:13: *hic enim super omnes scit se delinquere qui ex terrae materia fragilia uasa et sculptilia fingit*.

15.7 *Unde et mulierum maximeque adulescentularum uitat aspectum et in tantum castigator sui est, ut etiam quae tuta sunt pertimescat*.

For this reason, he shuns the sight of women, especially adolescent women, and he punishes himself so much that he even fears what is safe.

maximeque adulescentularum: Jerome indirectly insulted Vigilantius' lack of restraint, while alluding to his own retreat, although he still thought about the *chori puellarum* (Ep. 22.7).

That he was thinking about his own castigation is clear in what follows.

tuta sunt pertimescat: A Hieronymian hyperbolic expression, found only here and in *Epp.* 50.1 and 54.13.

Chapter XVI

16.1-2 *Cur, inquires, pergis ad heremum? Videlicet ut te non audiam, non uideam, ut tuo furore non mouear, ut tua bella non patiar, ne me capiat oculus meretricis, ne forma pulcherrima ad illicitos ducat amplexus.*

“Why,” you will ask, “do you head for the desert?” To avoid seeing and hearing you, of course; to not be agitated by your madness; to not endure your campaigns; so that a glance from a prostitute may not tempt me; so that a very lovely shape not lead me to illicit embraces.

Cur...heremum: Cf. Mt. 11:7ff. “*Inquires*” shows that this is not a verbatim citation of Vigilantius. Jerome imagines his opponent’s criticism.

tua bella non patiar: As mocking as these reasons might be, Jerome’s withdrawal to the desert was to escape the dangers of the city, although the dangers of the desert were not inconsiderable. His first days upon leaving Rome were difficult and he complained not only about the physical environment, but about his state of mind (*Ep.* 16.2):

uerum, ut ait gentilis poeta: caelum, non animum mutat, qui trans mare currit, ita me incessabilis inimicus postergum secutus est, ut maiora in solitudine bella nunc patiar.

But, as the pagan poet says, “He changes his sky, not his mind, who crosses the sea.” My tireless foe has followed closely behind me in this way so that I am enduring greater assaults in solitude.

ne...capiat...ne...ducat: Jerome was the susceptible and grammatical object of female allurements, which increased his need to be in solitude.

oculus meretricis: After all, *oculus meretricis laqueus est peccatoris* – an epigrammatic paraphrase of Prov. 29:3-5 used by others; e.g. Ambr. *De bon. mort.* 6.24, *De Cain et Abel* 1.4.14, *De paen.* 1.14; Hil. Pict. *Tract. Ps.* 123.9, 139.3.

16.3-5 *Respondebis: hoc non est pugnare, sed fugere. Sta in acie, aduersariis armatus obsiste, ut postquam uiceris coroneris. Fateor imbecillitatem meam.*

You will respond, “This is not fighting, but fleeing. Stand firm in the battleline, stand armed to face your adversaries so that you may be crowned after your victory.” I confess my own weakness.

pugnare: The military language that follows was a common way of describing the struggles of Christians against their persecutors and their demons, both literal and figurative. Sulpicius Severus, for example, presented Martin as the perfect soldier of Christ (VM 4.3); see also Aug. *De op. mon.* 28; Jer. *Ep.* 14.4.

armatus obsiste: Taken from Cic. *Phil.* 8.6: *hostis qui consuli armatus obsistit*.

Otherwise, this particular phrasing is rare and the word order is not elsewhere repeated.

imbecillitatem meam: Jerome was referring to what he wrote in 15.6, where knowing one's weakness is in itself a strength.

16.6-10 *Nolo spe pugnare uictoriae ne perdam aliquando uictoriam. Si fugero, gladium deuittui. Si stetero, aut uincendum mihi est, aut cadendum. Quid autem necesse est certa dimittere et incerta sectari? Aut scuto aut pedibus mors uitanda est.*

I do not wish to fight with a hope of victory, lest I lose that victory at some point. If I flee, I have avoided the sword; if I stand fast, I either conquer or fall. Why, then, is it necessary to cast aside what is certain and pursue what is not? One must avoid death either with a shield or with one's feet.

Some of the reasoning behind Jerome's defense is similar to what Cicero wrote in *De or.*

2.294-5:

sed tamen ego de mea nunc, non de aliorum facultate disputo confiteorque me, si quae premat res uehementius, ita cedere solere... non tam ut prosim causis elaborare soleo, quam ut ne quid obsim...

But nevertheless, I am now discussing my own abilities and not that of others and I confess that, if some matter presses too vehemently, I am accustomed to withdraw...I am accustomed to take pains not so much to advance my own causes as to not damage them...

In other words, the path of least resistance is the obvious choice. This tactic was not adopted by all monks, however. John Cassian, for example, wrote that a monk's duty was to fight back and not retreat (*De inst. coen.* 10.25, 11.19).

16.11-15 *Tu qui pugnās, et superari potes et uincere. Ego cum fugero, non uincor in eo quod fugio, sed ideo fugio, ne uincar. Nulla securitas est uicino serpente dormire. Potest fieri ut me non mordeat. Tamen potest fieri ut aliquando me mordeat.*

You, a fighter, can either conquer or be conquered. When I flee, I am not conquered because I am fleeing; I flee so that I may not be conquered. There is no freedom from anxiety sleeping next to a serpent. It is possible that it will not bite me; it is also possible that at some time it will.

serpente uicino: Jerome elsewhere wrote that deliberately being near every type of temptation was a dangerous game: *uteris balneis, cute nitida, rubicundus incedis, carnibus uesceris, affluis diuitiis, pretiosa ueste circumdaris et iuxta serpentem mortiferum securum dormire te credis?* (*Ep.* 128.3). For similar military language; e.g. Tac. *Hist.* 2.41.2, Suet. *Tib.* 16.2.

16.16-17 *Matres uocamus sorores et filias et non erubescimus uitiis nostris nomina pietatis obtendere. Quid facit monachus in cellulis feminarum?*

We call them mothers, sisters, and daughters, and we do not blush to draw the names of familial affection over our sins. What business does a monk have in women's cells?

nomina pietatis: That is, familial ties, as written by Jerome in *Ep.* 117.1: *mater et filia, nomina pietatis, uincla naturae secundaque post deum foederatio*. A biological relationship was supplanted by their collective relationship in God.

Quid...feminarum: Religious authors felt differently about how monks should cope with most temptations, with the exception of women. Jerome detailed the possible dangers in *Ep.* 125.7; John Cassian in *De inst. coen.* 6.13. Jerome, who frequented many holy women, was no stranger to similar suspicions, e.g. *Ep.* 45.2:

Multa me uirginum crebro turba circumdedit. Diuinos libros, ut potui, nonnullis saepe disserui. Lectio assiduitatem, assiduitas familiaritatem, familiaritas fiduciam fecerat. Dicant, quid umquam in me aliter senserint, quam Christianum decebat?

16.18-19 *Quid sibi uolunt sola et priuata colloquia et arbitrorum fugientes oculos? Sanctus amor impatientiam non habet.*

Why do they want private meetings, even fleeing the eyes of witnesses? Holy love does not have intolerance.

priuata colloquia: Any meeting in private was grounds for suspicion. Jerome inveighs against an unnamed man in *Ep.* 50.3 for doing the same:

Audio praeterea eum libenter uirginum et uiduarum cellulas circumire, et adducto supercilio, de sacris inter eas litteris philosophari. Quid in secreto, quid in cubiculo mulierculas docet?

I also hear that he eagerly goes around to the cells of virgins and widows and, with knitted brow, philosophizes about the sacred letters in their company. Why does he teach these weak women in secret, why in a private chamber?

He also writes to Sabinianus in *Ep.* 147, asking him to repent for trying to seduce a nun at Bethlehem.

Sanctus...habet: In other words, *caritas patiens est* (1 Cor. 13:4). More specifically, according to Jerome, a holy love did not have many things which he lists in *Ep.* 52.5; for instance, “*dulces litterulas*.” He also repeated the sentence in his letter to Furia, when he told her to avoid the company of men (*Ep.* 54.13).

16.20-21 *Quod de libidine diximus, referamus ad auaritiam et ad omnia uitia, quae uitantur solitudine. Et idcirco urbium frequentias declinamus, ne facere compellamur quae nos non tam natura cogit facere quam uoluntas.*

What we have said concerning desire, let us apply to greed and to all the vices that are avoided through solitude. For this very reason, we shun the crowds of the cities so that we may not feel compelled to do what desire, and not nature, compels us to do.

urbium frequentias declinamus: Jerome’s opinion about cities changed during his career, depending on his circumstances and the person with whom he was engaging in his many missives. In certain cases, Jerome praised some who could lead the most admirable Christian life in the city (*Ep.* 24.4); in others, the city was a menagerie of dangerous creatures. For example, before leaving for Jerusalem, Jerome recalled some of the people he met while in Rome in *Ep.* 45.2: *Osculabantur mihi manus quidam, et ore uipereio detrahebant*. In *Ep.* 54.5, Jerome warned

Furia against these monsters in Gaul: *Caue nutrices, et gerulas, et istiusmodi uenenata animalia*.

For more on Jerome's political approach to writing about city life, see Curran, J. 1997. "Jerome and the Sham Christians of Rome." *JEH* 48: 213-29.

Chapter XVII

17.1-2 *Haec, ut dixi, sanctorum presbyterorum rogatu unius noctis lucubratione dictaui, festinante admodum fratre Sisinnio et propter sanctorum refrigeria Aegyptum ire properante. Alioquin et ipsa materia apertam habuit blasphemiam, quae indignationem magis scribentis quam testimoniorum multitudinem flagitaret.*

At the request, as I have said, of the holy presbyters, I have dictated these words in the space of a single night's work since my brother, Sisinnius, is in a hurry and is hastening to go to Egypt so that he may provide aid to the saints; in other respects, the material itself was so openly blasphemous that it demanded the indignation of the writer more than a multitude of arguments.

lucubratione dictaui: Staying up all night for the purpose of writing, *TLL* s.v. *lucubratio* 1745.18ff. An appropriate way to write against a man nicknamed Dormitantius. As at the start of the treatise, Jerome adhered to the modesty *topos*, making his efforts appear humble. Cf. *Epp.* 127.14 and 129.8 for the same expression. See note on *CV* 3.9.

Sisinnio: See note on *CV* 3.3.

indignationem: At the conclusion of the treatise, Jerome alluded to the satirical heart of the text. Cf. *Juv. Sat.* 1.79: *si natura negat, facit indignatio uersum*. See Appendix C and Wiesen, *Satirist*.

17.3 *Quod si Dormitantius in mea rursus maledicta uigilauerit et eodem ore blasphemo, quo apostolos et martyres lacerat, de me quoque putauerit detrahendum, nequaquam illi breui lucubrationi uncula, sed tota nocte uigilabo et socii illius, immo discipulis uel magistris, qui, nisi tumentes uteros uiderint feminarum, maritos earum Christi ministerio arbitrantur indignos.*

But if Dormitantius stays up late in response to my slander, and if, with that same blasphemous mouth that he used to lash the apostles and martyrs, he thinks that I, too, should be dragged down in the mud, I will not merely stay up late; I will spend the entire night working against his allies, or rather his students or teachers, who, unless they see women's bellies swollen, judge their husbands to be unworthy of Christ's ministry.

ore...lacerat: The phrase was probably from *Cic. Phil.* 11.5: *optimum uirum incesto ore lacerasset*. The formulation was used in later authors, but only Jerome used it more than once (*Adv. Helv.* 22 and *Comm. in Is.* 5.20.1).

tumentes...indignos: Cf. CV 2.1. He concluded by issuing a challenge to Vigilantius as well as a threatening promise to his followers. All of the nonsense to which he had responded will end either now, or soon enough; he added a flourish to this challenge by parodying Vigilantius' beliefs one final time – that a pregnant woman may determine the worth of clergyman. See AJ 1 for Jovinian's argument that a virgin was not better than a wife in God's eyes. Jerome's opinion on women, children, and women with children has been clear in this text and elsewhere; see, for example, *Ep.* 50.5, wherein Jerome described swollen wombs in a similar context:

...non aequè inter fusos et calathos puellarum, et inter eruditos uiros de diuinae legis dogmatibus disputari. Nunc libere et impudenter iactat in uulgus, et perstrepat, damnat nuptias; et **inter uteros tumentes**, infantium uagitus, et lectulos maritorum, quid apostolus dixerit, tacet, ut me solum in inuidiam uocet.

...discussing the doctrines of the divine law among the spindles and wicker baskets of girls is one thing, and quite another to do so among learned men. Now, frankly and without shame, he bandies about in general, shouts, and accuses that Jerome condemns marriage; also, **among swollen wombs**, crying infants, and marriage-beds, he is silent about what the apostle says to summon me alone to others' spite.

Jerome writes the final word, "*indignos*" as a pun, looking back to the start of the treatise when he was inspired by *indignatio*.

Appendix A: Letter 61, written to Vigilantius in 396

1. Iustum quidem fuerat, nequaquam tibi litteris satisfacere, qui tuis auribus non credidisti - neque enim scidulae potes adquiescere, qui uiuo sermoni non accommodasti fidem -, sed quia Christus perfectae nobis humilitatis exemplar in se tribuit, dans osculum proditori, et latronis paenitentiam in patibulo suscipiens, eadem absenti significo, quae praesenti quoque locutus sum, me ita Origenem legisse uel legere, ut Apollinarem, ut ceteros tractatores, quorum in quibusdam libros ecclesia non recipit; non quo omnia dicam esse damnanda, quae in illorum uoluminibus continentur, sed quo quaedam reprehendenda confitear. Verum quia operis mei est et studii, multos legere, ut ex plurimis diuersos flores carpam non tam probaturus omnia, quam, quae bona sunt, electurus, adsumo multos in manu mea, ut a multis multa cognoscam secundum quod scriptum est: "*Omnia legentes, quae bona sunt, retinentes.*" Unde satis miror te uoluisse Origenis mihi obicere dogmata, cuius in plerisque errorem usque ad hanc aetatem penitus ignoras. Egone hereticus? et cur me, quaeso, haeretici non amant? Tu orthodoxus? qui etiam contra conscientiam tuam, et linguam alia praedicantem, aut inuitus subscripsisti, et praeuaricator es, aut uolens et hereticus. Dimisisti Aegyptum, cunctas prouincias reliquisti, in quibus sectam tuam libera plerique fronte defendunt: et elegisti me ad insectandum, qui omnia contra ecclesiae dogmata publica uoce condemno.

1. It would have been just in no way to satisfy you with a letter, because you did not believe your own ears - for you are unable to yield to a little sheet of paper, who were unwilling to have faith in a living voice -, but because Christ has given us an example of perfect humility in himself by kissing his betrayer and receiving the thief's repentance on the cross, I make the same thing clear to you in your absence, that I also said to you when you were present: that I have read and do read Origen as I do Apollinaris and other writers whose books the church has not fully accepted, but not so as to say that everything contained in those volumes must be condemned, but to admit that certain things need to be refuted. But, as it is my job and my purpose to read many authors in order to gather different flowers from as many sources as I can, not so much to approve of everything, but so as to isolate the passages that are good, I take up many books in my hand so that I may learn many things from many sources according to what is written: "*Reading all things, retaining what is good.*" For this reason, I rather marvel that you wanted to reproach me with Origen's doctrines, of whose error in many cases you, yourself, are quite unaware even to this day. Am I a heretic? Then why, I ask, do heretics not love me? Are you orthodox, you who, even against your own conscience and the words you preach from your mouth, either subscribed unwillingly and are a transgressor, or were willing and therefore a heretic? You dismissed Egypt, you left behind all the provinces in which the majority quite openly defends your sect, and you have chosen me to pursue when I publicly condemn all things contrary to church doctrine.

2. Origenes hereticus: quid ad me, qui illum in plerisque hereticum non nego? Errauit de resurrectione corporis; errauit de animarum statu, de diaboli paenitentia et - quod his maius est - filium et spiritum sanctum seraphin esse testatus est. Si errasse non dicerem et haec non cottidie anathematizarem, essem erroris illius socius. Neque enim ita debemus bona eius recipere, ut mala quoque suscipere cogamur. At idem et scripturas in multis bene interpretatus est, et prophetarum obscura disseruit et tam noui quam ueteris testamenti reuelauit maxima sacramenta. Si igitur, quae bona sunt, transtuli et mala uel amputaui uel correxi uel tacui, arguendus sum, cur per me Latini bona eius habeant, ignorant mala? Si hoc crimen est, arguatur confessor Hilarius, qui psalmorum interpretationem et homilias in Iob ex libris eius, id est ex Graeco, in Latinum transtulit, sit in culpa eiusdem confessionis Vercellensis Eusebius, qui omnium psalmorum commentarios heretici hominis uertit in nostrum eloquium, licet heretica praetermittens optima quaeque transtulerit. Taceo de Victorino Petobionensi et ceteris, qui Origenem in explanatione duntaxat scripturarum secuti sunt et expresserunt, ne non tam me defendere quam socios criminis uidear quaerere. Ad te ipsum ueniam: cur tractatus eius in Iob descriptos habes, in quibus contra diabolum et de stellis coeloque disputans quaedam locutus est, quae ecclesia non recipit?

2. Origen is a heretic: what is that to me, who do not deny that he is one in most things? He was wrong about the resurrection of the body; wrong about the condition of souls, about the repentance of the devil, and - what is worse than these - he argued that the Seraphim are the Son and the Holy Spirit. If I were not saying that he erred and if I did not anathematize him daily, then I would be an ally of his error. Indeed, we must not receive what is good in his works in such a way that we are forced to accept what is bad as well. But the same man still interpreted Scriptures well in many places, analyzed obscure passages of the prophets, and revealed the greatest sacraments of the New as much as of the Old Testament. If, therefore, I have translated what is good and have either cut, corrected, or remained silent about the bad, then must I be accused because, through me, Latin readers have his good work while knowing none of the bad? If this is a crime, then the confessor Hilary should be charged, because he translated the interpretation of the Psalms and the Homilies on Job from Origen's books, that is, from Greek into Latin. Eusebius of Vercellae, should also be guilty of the same confession, because he converted the heretical man's commentaries on all of the Psalms into our tongue, although, omitting the heretical parts, he translated all the best parts. I am silent about Victorinus of Petauium and others who merely followed and imitated Origen in his explanations—those of scripture at least, lest I seem not to defend myself but rather seek allies in my crime. I shall come to you yourself: why do you have copies of his tractates on Job, in which, arguing against the devil and about the stars and heaven, he said certain things that the church does not accept.

Tibi soli licet, τῷ σοφωτάτῳ κρανίῳ, de cunctis et Graecis et Latinis tractatoribus ferre sententiam et quasi censoria uirgula alios eicere de bibliothecis, alios recipere et, cum tibi placuerit, me uel catholicum uel hereticum pronuntiare: nobis non licet peruersa respuere et damnare, quod saepe damnauimus? Lege ad Ephesios libros, lege cetera opuscula mea et maxime in Ecclesiasten commentaries, et liquido peruidebis, me ab adolescentia nunquam alicuius auctoritate deterritum adqueuisse hereticae prauitati.

3. Non parum est scire, quod nescias: prudentis hominis est nosse mensuram suam nec zelo diaboli concitatum inperitiae suae cunctum orbem testem facere. Scilicet gloriari cupis, ut in patria tua iactites me non potuisse respondere eloquentiae tuae et acumen in te Chrysippi formidasse. Christiana uerecundia teneor et cellulae meae latebras nolo mordaci sermone reserare. Alioquin proferrem πᾶσαν τὴν ἀριστείαν σου καὶ τροπαιοφόρον paruulorum quoque uoce cantatum. sed haec aliis aut loquenda aut ridenda dimitto: ego quasi Christianus cum Christiano loquens obsecro te, frater, ne plus uelis sapere, quam sapis, ne uel innocentiam uel simplicitatem tuam uel certe ea, quae taceo et te non intellegente ceteri intellegunt, stilo proferas et ineptiarum tuarum cunctis cachinnum praebeas. Aliud a parua aetate didicisti, aliis adsuetus es disciplinis. non est eiusdem hominis et aureos nummos et scripturas probare, degustare uina et prophetas uel apostolos intellegere.

Is it permissible for you alone, wisest of heads, to pass judgment on all writers both Greek and Latin and, as if with a censor's wand, to cast out some authors from libraries, to accept others, and, when it pleases you, to pronounce me either a Catholic or a heretic? Is it not permissible for me to reject what is perverse and to condemn what I have often condemned? Read my books on Ephesians; read my other works, especially my commentaries on Ecclesiastes, and you will see clearly that, from my youth, I have never, scared by anyone's authority, acquiesced in heretical depravity.

3. It is no mean feat to know what you do not know. It is for a wise man to know his own measure and not to make the whole world a witness to his ignorance, incited by the devil's enthusiasm. Perhaps you wish to glorify yourself so that you may boast in your fatherland that I was unable to respond to your eloquence and that I dreaded the sharp wit of Chrysippus in you. I am checked by Christian modesty and I do not wish to open the retreats of my little cell with biting speech. Otherwise, I would put forth all of your virtue and victory sung by the voices of children, too. But, I leave these things to be either discussed or ridiculed by others: I, like a Christian speaking with a Christian, beseech you, brother, not to wish to know more than you know, lest you show with your pen either your innocence or your simplicity or certainly other things which I do not mention but others understand (even though you do not), and you offer everyone a reason to laugh at your folly. From a young age, you learned other things; you were used to other disciplines. The same man cannot examine both gold coins and passages of Scripture, taste wines and understand the prophets and apostles.

Me laceras, sanctum fratrem Oceanum in culpam hereseos uocas, presbyterorum tibi Vincentii et Pauliniani et fratris Eusebii iudicium displicet: solus es Cato, Romani generis disertissimus, qui testimonio tuo et prudentiae uelis credi. Recordare, quaeso, illius diei, quando me de resurrectione et ueritate corporis praedicante ex latere subsultabas et adplodebas pedem et orthodoxum conclamabas. Postquam nauigare coepisti et ad intimum cerebrum tuum sentinae putredo peruenit, tunc nos hereticos recordatus es. Quid tibi faciam? Credidi sancti Paulini presbyteri epistulis et illius super nomine tuo non putauit errare iudicium et, licet statim accepta epistula ἁσυνάρτητον sermonem tuum intellegerem, tamen rusticitatem et simplicitatem magis in te arbitrabar quam uecordiam. Nec reprehendo sanctum uirum - maluit enim apud me dissimulare, quod nouerat, quam portitorem clientulum suis litteris accusare - sed memet ipsum arguo, qui alterius potius adqueiui quam meo iudicio et oculis aliud cernentibus aliud scidulae credidi, quam uidebam.

4. Quam ob rem desine me lacerare et uoluminibus tuis obruere. Parce saltem nummis tuis, quibus notarios libentariosque conducens eisdem et scriptoribus uteris et fautoribus. Qui te ideo forsitan laudant, ut lucrum scribendo faciant. Si libet exercere ingenium, trade te grammaticis atque rhetoribus, disce dialecticam, sectis instruere philosophorum, ut, cum omnia didiceris, saltem tunc tacere incipias;

You attack me, you charge my holy brother Oceanus with heresy, and the judgment of presbyters Vincentius and Paulinian and brother Eusebius displeases you. You alone are Cato, the most eloquent of the Roman race, and you want us to believe your testimony and prudence. Recall, I ask, that day when you were almost jumping at my side as I preached about the resurrection and the reality of the body, stamping your feet and praising my orthodoxy. After you began to sail away and stench of the sewer arrived into the innermost part of your brain, then you remembered that I was a heretic. What could I do for you? I believed the letters of the holy presbyter Paulinus and did not think that his judgment about your name was wrong; and, although upon receiving his letter I immediately found your speech incoherent, nevertheless I judged that it was due more to your simplicity and lack of sophistication than madness. Nor I do reproach the holy man—for he preferred to hide from me what he knew than accuse his client and courier in his letters—but I find myself guilty because I listened to someone else's judgment rather than my own, and while my eyes saw one thing, I believed something else that I saw on a sheet of paper.

4. For this reason, stop attacking and overwhelming me with your volumes. At least spare your money with which you hire secretaries and copyists, using the same people as your writers and supporters. They praise you for this reason, perhaps, in order to make a profit by writing. If it is pleasing to exercise your talent, hand yourself over to grammarians and rhetoricians, learn dialectic, be instructed in the different schools of philosophers, so that, when you have learned everything, then you may at least begin to be silent.

quamquam stultum faciam magistro cunctorum magistros quaerere et ei modum inponere, qui loqui nescit et tacere non potest. Verum est illud apud Graecos prouerbium: ὄνῳ λύρα. Ego reor et nomen tibi κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν inpositum. Nam tota mente dormitas et profundissimo non tam somno stertis quam lethargo. Inter ceteras quippe blasphemias, quas ore sacrilege protulisti, ausus es dicere montem, de quo abscisus est in Danihelo lapis sine manibus, esse diabolum et lapidem Christum, qui adsumpsit corpus Adam, qui diabolo ante per uitia cohaeserat, natum esse de uirgine, ut a monte, hoc est a diabolo, hominem separaret. O praecidendam linguam ac per partes et frusta lacerandam! Quisquamne Christianus deum patrem omnipotentem in persona diaboli interpretatur et tanto piaculo totius orbis aures maculat? Si interpretationem tuam quisquam non dicam catholicorum sed hereticorum siue gentilium umquam recepit, pium sit, quod locutus es; sin autem tantum nefas numquam Christi audiuit ecclesia et per tuum primum os ipse se montem interpretatus est, qui dixerat: “*Ero similis altissimo*,” age paenitentiam et in sacco uersare et cinere et tantum scelus iugibus absterge lacrimis, si tamen tibi dimittatur haec impietas et iuxta errorem Origenis tunc ueniam consequaris, quando consecuturus est et diabolus, qui numquam plus quam per os tuum deprehenditur blasphemasse. meam iniuriam patienter tuli: impietatem contra deum ferre non potui, unde et uisus sum mordacius in extrema epistula scribere, quam promiseram;

Nevertheless, I may be acting foolishly, seeking teachers for the teacher of everyone and setting a limit on the one who does not know how to speak and cannot be silent. The Greek proverb is true: “a lyre for an ass.” I think that even your name was given to you out *ex contrario*. For you are always nodding off and you snore, not so much from a very deep sleep but from lethargy. In fact, among the other blasphemies you brought forth with your sacrilegious mouth, you dared to say that the mountain in Daniel from which the stone was cut without hands is the devil, and that the stone is Christ, who, having taken the body of Adam (who had clung to the devil before through his sins), was born from a virgin to separate mankind from the mountain, that is, from the devil. Your tongue should be cut out and torn into bits and pieces! Does any Christian read into God the Father Almighty the character of the devil and defile the ears of the whole world with such wickedness? If *anyone* (I do not mean just Catholics, but heretics or heathen!) has ever accepted your interpretation, then let what you said be considered pious; however, if the church of Christ has never heard such impiety, and if through your mouth first he interpreted himself as the mountain, who once said: “*I shall be similar to the Most High*,” then repent, roll in sackcloth and ashes, and cleanse your great impiety with constant tears, if you should still be forgiven this impiety and, according to the error of Origen, you should obtain pardon at that future time, when even the devil will obtain it, who has never been caught blaspheming more than through your lips. I have tolerated my injury with patience: I have been unable to tolerate impiety against God, however, and for this reason I seemed to write more biting at the end of this letter than I had promised.

quamquam post priorem paenitentiam, qua a me ueniam deprecatus es, iterum commisisse, unde agas paenitentiam, stolidissimum sit. Tribuat tibi Christus, ut audias et taceas, ut intellegas et sic loquaris.

Even though after your prior penance when you sought pardon from me it would be extremely foolish to do something again for which you will do penance. May Christ grant you the ability to hear and be silent, to understand and so to speak.

Appendix B: Letter 109, written to Riparius in 404

1. Acceptis litteris tuis primitus non respondere superbiae est, respondere temeritatis. De his enim rebus interrogas, quae et proferre et audire sacrilegium est. Ais Vigilantium, qui κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν hoc uocatur nomine - nam Dormitantius rectius diceretur - os fetidum rursus aperire et putorem spurcissimum contra sanctorum martyrum proferre reliquias et nos, qui eas suscipimus, appellare cinerarios et idolatras, qui mortuorum hominum ossa ueneremur. O infelicem hominem et omni lacrimarum fonte plangendum, qui haec dicens non se intellegit esse Samaritam et Iudaeum, qui corpora mortuorum pro inmundis habent et etiam uasa, quae in eadem domo fuerint, pollui suspicantur sequentes occidentem litteram et non spiritum uiuificantem. Nos autem non dico martyrum reliquias, sed ne solem quidem et lunam, non angelos, non archangelos, non seraphim, non cherubim et “*omne nomen, quod nominatur et in praesenti saeculo et in futuro,*” colimus et adoramus, ne seruiamus “*creaturae potius quam creatori, qui est benedictus in saecula.*” Honoramus autem reliquias martyrum, ut eum, cuius sunt martyres, adoremus, honoramus seruos, ut honor seruorum redundet ad dominum, qui ait: “*Qui uos suscipit, me suscipit.*” Ergo Petri et Pauli imundae sunt reliquiae? Ergo Moysi corpusculum inmundum erit, quod iuxta Hebraicam ueritatem ab ipso sepultum est domino? Et quotienscumque apostolorum et prophetarum et omnium martyrum basilicas ingredimur, totiens idolorum templa ueneramur accensique ante tumulos eorum cerei idolatriae insignia sunt?

1. Having received your letters, not responding at first would be arrogant, responding would be rash; for you are asking about matters that are sacrilegious to utter and hear. You say that Vigilantius, who is called “wakeful” *ex contrario* – for he would more correctly be called Dormitantius –, is opening his fetid mouth again and pouring forth the foulest filth against the relics of the holy martyrs. He is also calling us, because we receive the relics, ash-mongers and idolaters, since we honor dead men’s bones. Oh unhappy man, to be wept for with every spring of tears. In saying these things, he does not understand that he is a Samaritan and a Jew, people who consider corpses unclean and even suspect that the vessels which were in the same house as them are polluted, following the letter that kills and not the living spirit. Moreover, we far from worshipping or adoring the relics of the martyrs, do not even worship and adore the sun and the moon, not angels, not archangels, not the seraphim, the cherubim, and “*every name which is named both in the present time and in the future,*” lest we serve “*the creature rather than creator, who is blessed in the ages.*” We honor the relics of the martyrs in order to honor him whose martyrs they are; we honor his servants so that the honor of his servants may redound to the credit of the Lord who says, “*Who receives you, receives me.*” Thus, are the relics of Peter and Paul unclean? Will the dead body of Moses be unclean, which, according to the Hebrew truth was buried by the Lord himself? And, whenever we enter the basilicas of the apostles, prophets, and of any martyrs, do we just as often venerate the temples of idols, and are the candles burned before their tombs signs of idolatry?

Plus aliquid dicam, quod redundet in auctoris caput et insanum cerebrum uel sanet aliquando uel debeat, ne tantis sacrilegiis simplicum animae subuertantur. Ergo et domini corpus in sepulchro positum inmundum fuit et angeli, qui candidis uestibus utebantur, mortuo cadaueri atque polluto praebebant excubias, ut post multa saecula Dormitantius somniaret, immo eructuaret inmundissimam crapulam et cum Iuliano, persecutore sanctorum, basilicas aut destrueret aut in templa conuerteret?

2. Miror sanctum episcopum, in cuius parrochia esse presbyter dicitur, adquiescere furori eius et non uirga apostolica uirgaque ferrea confringere uas inutile et tradere in interitum carnis, ut spiritus saluus fiat. Meminerit illius dicti: *“Videbas furem et concurrebas cum eo et cum adulteris portionem tuam ponebas.”* Et in alio loco: *“In matutino interficiebam omnes peccatores terrae, ut disperderem de ciuitate domini omnes operantes iniquitatem,”* et iterum: *“Nonne odientes te, domine, odio habui et super inimicos tuos tabescebam? Perfecto odio oderam illos.”* Si non sunt honorandae reliquiae martyrum, quomodo legimus: *“Pretiosa in conspectus domini mors sanctorum eius”*? Si ossa eorum polluunt contingentes, quomodo Heliseus mortuus mortuum suscitauit et dedit uitam, quod iuxta Vigilantium iacebat inmundum? Ergo omnia castra Israhelitici exercitus et populi dei fuere inmundum, quia Ioseph et patriarcharum corpora portabant in solitudine et ad sanctam terram inmundos cineres retulerunt?

I could say something more that may flow back upon the author’s head and may either cure at some time or destroy his insane brain, so that the souls of simple people may not be subverted by monstrous sacrileges. Thus, was also the body of the Lord unclean when it was placed in the sepulcher, and were the angels, who were wearing white garments, keeping watch over a dead and polluted corpse, so that after many centuries Dormitantius might dream, or rather release the filthiest belch from his hangover, and, with Julian, the persecutor of holy men, either destroy basilicas or convert them into temples?

2. I am surprised that the holy bishop, in whose parish the presbyter is said to be, gives in to Vigilantium’s madness and does not break this useless vessel with an apostolic, rather, an iron rod and hand him over to the death of his flesh so that his spirit may be saved. Let him recall this saying: *“You saw a thief and you ran with him and you placed your portion among adulterers.”* And in another passage: *“In the morning I killed all the sinners of the earth, so that I might destroy from the city of the Lord all those committing injustices,”* and again: *“Do I not hate all those that hate you, Lord, and was I not wasting away because of your enemies? I hated them with perfect hatred.”* If the relics of the martyrs are not to be honored, how comes it that we read: *“Precious in the eyes of the Lord is the death of his saints”*? If their bones pollute those who touch them, how did Elisha, when he was dead, revive a dead man and give life [to a body] that according to Vigilantium was lying unclean? Then, were all the camps of the host of Israel and the people of God unclean, because they were carrying around Joseph and the bodies of the patriarchs in the wilderness and brought back their dirty ashes to the Holy Land?

Ioseph quoque in typo praecedens domini et saluatoris nostri sceleratus fuit, quia tanta ambitione Iacob in Chebron ossa portauit, ut inmundum patrem auo et atauo sociaret inmundis et mortuum mortuis copularet? Praecidenda lingua a medicis, immo insanum curandum caput, ut, loqui qui nescit, discat aliquando reticere. Ego, ego uidi hoc aliquando portentum et testimoniis scripturarum quasi uinculis Hippocratis uolui ligare furiosum, sed, “abiit, excessit, euasit, erupit” et inter Adriae fluctus Cottique regis Alpes in nos declamando clamauit. Quidquid enim amens loquitur, uociferatio et clamor est appellandus.

3. Tacita me forsitan cogitatione reprehendas, cur in absentem inuehar. Fateor tibi dolorem meum: sacrilegium tantum patienter audire non possum. Legi enim siromasten Finees, austeritatem Heliae, zelum Simonis Chananaei, Petri seueritatem Ananiam et Sapphiram trucidantis Paulique constantiam, qui Elymam magum uiis domini resistentem aeterna caecitate damnauit. Non est crudelitas pro deo pietas. Unde et in lege dicitur: “*Si frater tuus et amicus et uxor, quae est in sinu tuo, deprauare te uoluerit a ueritate, sit manus tua super eos et effundes sanguinem eorum et auferes malum de medio Israhel.*” Iterum dicam: ergo martyrum inmundae sunt reliquiae? Et quid passi sunt apostoli, ut inmundum Stephani corpus tanta funeris ambitione praecederent et facerent ei planctum magnum, ut illorum luctus in nostrum gaudium uerteretur?

Then was Joseph, as a typological forerunner of our Lord and savior, also wicked, because he carried the bones of Jacob into Hebron with great pomp, so that he might join an unclean father to an unclean grandfather and great grandfather, and so that he might join the dead with the dead? His tongue needs to be cut out by doctors; or, rather, his crazy head needs to be cured, so that this man, who does not know how to speak, may at some time learn how to keep quiet. I, for my part, I have seen this portent at some time and I wanted to bind this raging man with passages from Scripture just like the chains of Hippocrates, but “he departed, he withdrew, he escaped, he broke out” and between the waves of the Adriatic and the Alps of King Cottius, he shouted out, declaiming against us. For whatever a crazy man says must be called an outcry and mere noise.

3. Perhaps you reproach me silently about why I am inveighing against someone who is absent. I confess to you my grief: I am unable to listen to such sacrilege with patience. For I have read about the javelin of Phineas, the harshness of Elijah, the zeal of Simon the Zealot, the severity of Peter when he killed Ananias and Sapphira, and the constancy of Paul, who condemned Elymas the sorcerer, who was resisting the ways of the Lord, to eternal blindness. Dutifulness for God is not cruelty. For this reason, it is also stated in the law: “*If your brother and friend and wife, who is in your bosom, wanted to pervert you from the truth, may your hand be upon them and may you shed their blood and remove the evil from the middle of Israel.*” Again I shall ask, are the relics of the martyrs unclean? And why did the apostles allow themselves to walk in before the unclean body of Stephen with such a proud funeral procession and to lament greatly for him, so that their grief might be turned into our joy?

Nam quod dicis eum uigilias execrari, facit et hoc contra uocabulum suum, ut uelit dormire Vigilantius et non audiat saluatorem dicentem: *“Sic non potuistis una hora uigilare mecum? Vigilate et orate, ut non intretis in temptationem. Spiritus promptus, sed caro infirma.”* Et in alio loco propheta decantat: *“Media nocte surgebam, ut confiterer tibi super iudicia iustitiae tuae.”* Dominum quoque in euangelio legimus pernoctasse et apostolos clausos carcere tota nocte uigilasse, ut illis psallentibus terra quateretur, custos carceris crederet, magistratus et ciuitas terrentur. Loquitur Paulus: *“Orationi insistite uigilantes in ea”* et in alio loco: *“in uigiliis frequenter.”* Dormiat itaque Vigilantius et ab exterminatore Aegypti cum Aegyptiis dormiens suffocetur; nos dicamus cum Daud: *“Non dormitabit neque obdormiet, qui custodit Israhel,”* ut ueniat ad nos sanctus et Hir, qui interpretatur ‘uigil.’ Et si quando propter peccata nostra dormierit, dicamus ad eum: *“Exsurge, ut quid dormitas, domine?”* Excitemusque illum et nauicula fluctuante clamemus: *“Magister, saluos nos fac, perimus.”*

4. Plura dictare uolueram, si non epistolaris breuitas pudorem nobis tacendi inponeret et si tu librorum ipsius ad nos uoluisses mittere cantilenas, ut scire possemus, ad quae rescribere deberemus. Nunc autem aerem uerberauimus et non tam illius infidelitatem, quae omnibus patet, quam nostra fidem aperuimus. Ceterum, si uolueris longiorem nos aduersum eum librum scribere, mitte nenias illius et ineptias, ut Iohannem Baptistam audiat praedicantem:

And as to your saying that Vigilantius execrates vigils, he does this too in opposition to his own name, so that Vigilantius may wish to sleep and not to hear the Savior saying, *“Were you thus unable to keep vigil with me for one hour? Stay awake and pray, lest you enter into temptation. The spirit is ready, but the flesh is weak.”* And in another passage the prophet recites, *“I awoke in the middle of the night, so that I might profess to you the judgments of your justice.”* We also read in the Gospel that the Lord kept guard all night and that the apostles who were shut up in prison stayed awake all night, so that the earth might shake from their singing of the Psalms, the guard of the prison might believe, and the magistrate and the citizenry might be terrified. Paul says, *“Persist in prayer and stay awake in it,”* and in another place, *“in vigils frequently.”* And so, let Vigilantius sleep, and in his sleep let him be choked by the destroyer of Egypt along with the Egyptians; let us say with David, *“He who guards Israel shall not rest or sleep,”* so that the holy one may come to us and the Watcher, who is translated as “vigil.” And if he ever sleeps on account of our sins, let us say to him, *“Rise, why do you keep on sleeping, Lord?”* And let us wake him and shout, when our ship is being tossed, *“Master, save us, we are perishing.”*

4. I had wanted to dictate more, if epistolary brevity were not shaming me into silence and if you had been willing to send to us the little ditties of that man, so that we might be able to know to what we ought to respond. As yet, we have struck the air and revealed not so much that man’s lack of faith - which is plain to everyone - as our own faith. But, if you want us to write a longer piece against him, send his trifles and foolishnesses/idiocies, so that he may hear the preaching of John the Baptist:

“iam securis ad radices arborum posita est. Omnis arbor, quae non facit fructum bonum, excidetur et in ignem mittetur.”

“Now the axe is placed at the roots of the trees. Let every tree that does not bear good fruit be cut down and thrown into the fire.”

Appendix C: The Genre of the *Contra Vigilantium*

Jerome's treatises have been mined for examples of satire and polemic.¹ These technical terms are applied broadly to Jerome's style and technique. Because this has been the case, the genre of the present treatise has not been determined. Satirical intertexts appear in the work; for example, the conclusion of the treatise reveals one of Jerome's motivations for writing: "*ipsa materia apertam habuit blasphemiam, quae indignationem magis scribentis quam testimoniorum multitudinem flagitaret.*" This alludes to Juvenal's programmatic statement that, "*si natura negat, facit indignatio uersum.*"²

Even though some satiric elements may be found, they are subordinate to the overall tone and purpose of invective, which is the genre of the present work. According to Koster, "Die Invektive ist eine strukturierte literarische Form, deren Ziel es ist, mit allen geeigneten Mitteln eine namentlich genannte Person öffentlich vor dem Hintergrund der jeweils geltenden Werte und Normen als Persönlichkeit herabzusetzen."³ This verbal assault can be instigated by openly recounting the target's faults, organized according to certain categories. Craig has listed 17 different invective *loci* that are here listed for reference:⁴

1. embarrassing family origins
2. being unworthy of one's family
3. physical appearance
4. eccentricity of dress
5. gluttony and drunkenness
6. hypocrisy in appearing virtuous
7. avarice, sometimes linked with prodigality

¹¹ Wiesen, *Satirist*, Opelt, *Streitschriften*, etc.

² Juv. *Sat.* 1.79.

³ Koster, S. 1980. *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, p.30.

⁴ Craig, C. 2004. "Audience Expectations, Invective, and Proof," in J. Powell and J. Paterson, eds. *Cicero the Advocate*, 187-214. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 190-1.

8. taking bribes
9. pretentiousness
10. sexual conduct
11. hostility to one's family
12. cowardice in war
13. financial embarrassment
14. aspiring to *regnum* or tyranny
15. cruelty to citizens and allies
16. plunder of private and public property
17. oratorical ineptitude

Seven of these *loci* feature in the *Contra Vigilantium*. Jerome almost immediately insulted Vigilantius for being the son of an innkeeper – casting him among the dregs of society (#1, CV 1.10). Jerome also attacked Vigilantius' gluttony and drunkenness (#5, CV 3.4, 11.2), hypocrisy in appearing virtuous (#6, CV 2.1), and sexual conduct (#10, CV 2 passim). In CV 4.1 of the text, Jerome suggested #16, by stating, "*Nimirum respondeat generi suo, ut qui de latronum et conuenarum natus est semine.*" While Vigilantius' physical appearance was not mentioned, an embarrassing anecdote reveals his eccentricity of dress – Vigilantius was once caught praying in the nude (#4, CV 11). Lastly, Jerome found fault with his opponent's style, calling him "*sermone inconditus*" (#17, CV 3.5).

The invective *loci* are not exclusive to Jerome's offensive maneuvers against Vigilantius. Jerome in several instances preemptively argued in defense of what he anticipated would be Vigilantius' attack. For example, he imagines a conversation with his opponent in 16.1-5:

Cur, inquires, pergis ad heremum? Videlicet ut te non audiam, non uideam, ut tuo furore non mouear, ut tua bella non patiar, ne me capiat oculus meretricis, ne forma pulcherrima ad illicitos ducat amplexus. Respondebis: hoc non est pugnare, sed fugere. Sta in acie, aduersariis armatus obsiste, ut postquam uiceris coroneris. Fateor imbecillitatem meam.

What Jerome imagines is an interlocutor who will challenge him on a subject matter befitting an invective – cowardice in the face of battle (#12), albeit in this case the ascetic struggle.

Bibliography

- Adams, J. N. 1982. *Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 2011. "Late Latin," in J. Clackson, ed. *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 257-83.
- Adkin, N. 2000. "Did the Romans Keep Their Underwear on in Bed?" *CW* 93: 619-20.
- . 2003. *Jerome on Virginité: A Commentary on the Libellus de uirginitate seruanda (Letter 22)*. Cambridge: Francis Cairns.
- Angenendt, A. 1994. *Heilige und Reliquien: Die Geschichte ihres Kultes vom frühen Christentum bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: Beck.
- Arns, P. E. 1953. *La technique du livres d'après Saint Jérôme*. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Asiedu, F. B. A. 2001. "The Song of Songs and the Ascent of the Soul: Ambrose, Augustine, and the Language of Mysticism." *VigChr* 55 (3): 299-317.
- Behaghel, O. 1932. *Deutsche Syntax*, Vol. 4. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Verlag.
- Berchman, R.M. 2005. *Porphyry Against the Christians*. Leiden: Brill.
- Boddens Hosang, F. J. E. 2010. *Establishing Boundaries: Christian-Jewish Relations in Early Council Texts and the Writings of the Church Fathers*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bolkestein, H. 1939. *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum*. Utrecht: A. Oosthoek.
- Bömer, F. 1943. *Ahnenkult und Ahnenglaube im alten Rom*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Bonwetsch, G.N. 1881. *Die Geschichte des Montanismus*. Erlangen: Verlag von Andreas Deichert.
- Booth, A.D. 1979. "The Date of Jerome's Birth." *Phoenix* 33: 346-52.
- Bowes, K. 2001. "...*Nec sedere in uillam*; Villa Churches, Rural Piety and the Priscillian Controversy," in T. Burns and J. Eadie. *Urban Centers and Rural Contexts in Late Antiquity*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 323-48.
- . 2005. "'Une coterie espagnole pieuse': Christian archaeology and Christian communities in fourth- and fifth-century Hispania," in Bowes, K. and M. Kulikowski, eds. 2005. *Hispania in Late Antiquity: Current Perspectives*. Leiden and Boston, 189-258.

- . 2008. *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Box, G.H. 1913. "IV Ezra," in R.H. Charles, ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2.542-624.
- Brakke, D. 2006. *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Braverman, J. 1978. *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel. A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible*. Washington: The Catholic Bible Association.
- Brooks, R. 1983. *Support for the Poor in the Mishnaic Law of Agriculture: Tractate Pe'ah*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Brown, P. 1981. *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2012. *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bundy, E.L. 1962. *Studia Pindarica I and II*. Berkeley: University of California Publications in Classical Philology 18.
- Burgess, R.W. 2003. "The *Passio S. Artemii*, Philostorgius, and the Dates of the Invention and Translations of the Relics of Sts Andrew and Luke." *Analecta Bollandiana* 121 (1): 5-36.
- Burke, P.F. 1993. "Roman Rites of the Dead and the Cult of the Saints." *Bulletin des Antiquités Luxembourgeoises* 22: 1-12.
- Bury, J.B. 1904. "The Origin of Pelagius." *Hermathena* 13: 26-35.
- Bynum, Caroline W. 1994. "Images of the Resurrection Body in the Theology of Late Antiquity." *Catholic Historical Review* 80: 215-237.
- . 1995. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Cain, A. and J. Lössl, eds. 2009. *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- . 2009b. "Jerome's *Epistula* 117 on the *Subintroductae*: Satire, Apology, and Ascetic Propaganda in Gaul." *Augustinianum* 49: 119-143.

- . 2013. *Jerome and the Monastic Clergy: A Commentary on Letter 52 to Nepotian, with an Introduction, Text, and Translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Cameron, A., J. Long, and L. Sherry. 1993. *Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Capelle, W. 1924. "Erdbebenforschung." *Paulys Realencyclopädie* Suppl. 4:344-74.
- Castellanos, S.M. 1995-1996. "Vigilancio y El Culto a Los Santos y Sus Reliquias en El Occidente Tardoantiguo." *Studia Historica. Historia Antigua* 13-14: 405-420.
- Cavallera, F. 1922. *Saint Jérôme: sa vie et son oeuvre*. 2 vols. Paris: Louvain.
- Chadwick, H. 1948. "Origen, Celsus and the Resurrection of the Body." *HThR* 41(2): 83-102.
- . 1976. *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Clark E. A. 1982. "Claims on the Bones of Saint Stephen: the Partisans of Melania and Eudocia." *CH* 51: 141-156.
- . 1989. "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism: Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 5 (2): 25-46.
- . 1992. *The Origenist Controversy. The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1994. "Ideology, History, and the Consturction of 'Woman' in Late Ancient Christianity." *JECS* 2 (2): 155-84.
- Clark, G. 1999. "Victricius of Rouen : « Praising the Saints »." *JECS* 7 (3): 365-399.
- . 2001. "Translating Relics: Victricius of Rouen and Fourth-Century Debate." *EME* 10 (2): 161-176.
- Cleary, S.E. 2007. *Rome in the Pyrenees: Lugdunum and the Convenae from the First Century BC to the Seventh Century AD*. London: Routledge.
- Combet-Farnoux, B. 1980. *Mercure romain: Le culte public de Mercure et la fonction mercantile à Rome de la république archaïque à l'époque augustéenne*. Rome: Ecole française de Rome.
- Conring, B. 2001. *Hieronymus als Briefschreiber. Ein Beitrag zur spätantiken Epistolographie*. Tübingen: JCB Mohr.

- Constas, N.P. 2001. "« to Sleep, Perchance to Dream » : The Middle State of Souls in Patristic and Byzantine Literature." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 55: 91-124.
- . 2002. "An Apology for the Cult of the Saints in Late Antiquity : Eustratius Presbyter of Constantinople, « On the State of Souls After Death » (CPG 7522)." *JECS* 10 (2): 267-285.
- Copley, F. 1956. *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Courcelle, P. 1947. "Paulin de Nole et Saint Jérôme." *Revue des études latines* 25: 250-80.
- . 1954. "Un nouveau traité d'Eutrope, prêtre aquitain vers l'an 400." *REA* 56: 377-90.
- Cox Miller, P. 1996. "Jerome's Centaur: A Hyper-Icon of the Desert " *JECS* 4 (2): 209-233.
- . 1997. *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2000. "The Little Blue Flower is Red: Relics and the Poetizing of the Body." *JECS* 8 (2): 213-36.
- . 2004. "Visceral Seeing: The Holy Body in Late Antique Christianity." *JECS* 12 (4): 391-411.
- . 2009. *The Corporeal Imagination: Signifying the Holy in Late Ancient Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Coyle, J.K. 2009. *Manichaeism and Its Legacy*. Leiden: Brill.
- Craig, C. 2004. "Audience Expectations, Invective, and Proof," in J. Powell and J. Paterson, eds. *Cicero the Advocate*, 187-214. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crouzel, H. 1972a. "Saint Jérôme et ses amis toulousains." *BLE* 73: 125-146.
- . 1972b. "Chronologie proposée du prêtre commingeois Vigilance de Calagurris." *BLE* 73: 265-66.
- . 1983. "Un 'piccolo cliente' di San Paolino di Nola: Vigilanzio di Calagurris." *Paolino di Nola: Momenti della sua via e delle sue opere*: 199-219.
- . 1985. "Un 'Hérétique' Commingeois aux IVe et Ve Siècles: Vigilance de Calagurris." *Mémoires de la Société archéologique du Midi de la France* 66-67: 163-174.
- Cumont, F. 1949. *Lux Perpetua*. Paris: Geuthner.
- Curran, J. 1997. "Jerome and the Sham Christians of Rome." *JEH* 48: 213-29.

- Dahl, M. E. 1962. *The Resurrection of the Body. A Study of I Corinthians 15*. London: SCM Press.
- Delehaye, H. 1933. *Les Origines du Culte des Martyrs*. Bruxelles: Societe des Bollandistes.
- De Nie, G. 2003. *Word, Image, and Experience: Dynamics of Miracle and Self-Perception in Sixth-Century Gaul*. Ashgate: University of Michigan Press.
- . 2012. *Poetics of Wonder: Testimonies of the New Christian Miracles in the Late Antique Latin World*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Di Lella, A. 2001. "The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel," in J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint, eds. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 2.542-624.
- Dionisotti, A. 1982. "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives." *JRS* 72: 83-125.
- Dulaey, M. 1973. *Le rêve dans la vie et la pensée de saint Augustin*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.
- Dunn, G.D. 2012. "The Call to Perfection, Financial Asceticism, and Jerome." *Augustinianum* 52: 197-218.
- Duval, Y.-M. 2003. *L'affaire Jovinien: d'une crise de la société romaine à une crise de la pensée chrétienne à la fin du IV et au début du Ve siècle*. Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum.
- Ehrman, B. 2006. *The Lost Gospel of Judas: A New Look at Betrayer and Betrayed*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elm, S. 1994. *Virgins of God: The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elsner, J. 2000. "From the Culture of Spolia to the Cult of Relics : The Arch of Constantine and the Genesis of Late Antique Forms." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 68: 149.
- Evans, E. 1960. *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection*. London: SPCK.
- Feichtinger, B. 1995. *Apostolae Apostolorum: Frauenaskese als Befreiung und Zwang bei Hieronymus*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Feiertag, J.-L. 2005a. Hieronymus: *Adversus Vigilantium*. *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 79C. Turnhout: Brepols.

- . 2005b. "Vigilance et Jérôme sur la lecture d'Origène dans un florilège du XI^e siècle." *REA* 51 (2): 279-296.
- Ferreiro, A. 1993. "Jerome's polemic against Priscillian in his *Letter to Ctesiphon* (133, 4)." *REA* 39: 309-32.
- Finn, R.D. 2006. *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice 313-450*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fontaine, J. 1982. "Victrice de Rouen et Les Origines du Monachisme dans l'Ouest de La Gaule (IV^e - VI^e Siecles)." *Aspects du Monachisme en Normandie (IV^e - XVIII^e Siecles): Actes du Colloque Scientifique de l'Annee des Abbayes Normades*: 9-29.
- Force, P. 2003. "Vigilance de Calagurris et La Critique du Culte des Reliques : Éléments pour une théologie du culte des reliques." *Connaissance des Pères de l'Église* 89: 15-26.
- Freud, W.H.C. 1954. "Gnostic Sects and the Roman Empire." *JEH* 5: 25-37.
- Gager, J. G. 1982. "Body-Symbols and Social Reality. Resurrection, Incarnation and Asceticism in Early Christianity." *Religion* 12: 345-363.
- Garnsey, P. 1970. *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ghellinck, J. de. 1924. *Pour l'histoire du mot sacramentum*. Paris: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense.
- Gill, D.W.J. and B.W. Winter. 1994. "Acts and Roman Religion," in Gill, D.W.J. and C. Gempf, eds. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting: Graeco-Roman Setting*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, pp. 79-102.
- Gilly, W. 1844. *Vigilantius and his times*. London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley.
- Grabar, A. 1946. *Martyrium: Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Griffe, É. 1964-65. *La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine*, 3 vols. Paris: Letouzey & Ané.
- Grimm, V.E. 1996. *From Feasting to Fasting: The Evolution of a Sin*. London: Routledge.
- Groot, A.W. de. 1919. *A Handbook of Antique Prose-rhythm*. Groningen: The Hague.
- Grützmacher, G. 1901-8. *Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Dietrich.
- Gryson, R. 1970. *Les origines du célibat ecclésiastique: du premier au septième siècle*. Gembloux: J. Duculot.

- Haarhoff, T. 1920. *Schools of Gaul: A Study of Pagan and Christian Education in the Last Century of the Western Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Habinek, T. 2005. *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hagendahl, H. 1958. *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*. Göteborg: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Harries, J. 1992. "Death and the Dead in the Late Roman West," in S. Bassett, ed. *Death in Towns: Urban Responses to the Dying and the Dead, 100-1600*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Harris, J.R. and A. Mingana. 1920. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Harris, W.V. 2009. *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hartman, L. 1978. *Daniel. The Anchor Bible*. New York: Doubleday.
- Head, T. 1999. "Discontinuity and Discovery in the Cult of Saints: Apulia from Late Antiquity to the High Middle Ages." *Hagiographica* 6: 171-211.
- Heid, S. 2000. *Celibacy in the Early Church: The Beginnings of a Discipline of Obligatory Continence for Clerics in East and West*. San Francisco: Ignatius.
- Heller, J. 1943. *Nenia*. Diss. Lancaster Press.
- Hijmans, B.L. et al., eds. 1995. *Gröningen Commentaries on Apuleius*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Holum, K. G. and Vikan, G. 1979. "The Trier Ivory, Adventus Ceremonial, and the Relics of St. Stephen." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 33: 113-133.
- Horbury, W. 1998. "The Cult of Christ and the Cult of the Saints." *New Testament Studies* 44 (3): 444-469.
- Hritz, J.N. 1939. *The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome*. Catholic University of America.
- Hunter, D. 1987. "Resistance to the Virginal Ideal in Late Fourth-Century Rome: the Case of Jovinian." *ThSt* 48: 45-64.
- . 1993. "Helvidius, Jovinian, and the Virginity of Mary in Late Fourth-Century Rome." *J ECS* 1: 47-71.

- . 1999. "Vigilantius of Calagurris and Victricius of Rouen: Ascetics, Relics, and Clerics in Late Roman Gaul." *JECS* 7 (3): 401-430.
- . 2000. "The Virgin, the Bride, and the Church: Reading Psalm 45 in Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine." *CH* 69 (2): 281-303.
- . 2007. *Marriage, Celibacy, and Heresy in Ancient Christianity: The Jovinianist Controversy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2009. "The Significance of Ambrosiaster." *JECS* 17 (1): 1-26.
- Jamieson, K. 1987. "Jerome, Augustine and the Stesichoran Palinode." *Rhetorica* 5.4: 353-67.
- Jay, P. 1985. *L'Exégèse de Saint Jérôme: D'après son "Commentaire sur Isaïe."* Paris: Études Augustinienne.
- Johnston, S.I. 1999. *Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kahlos, M. 2010. "Rhetorical Strategies in Jerome's Polemical Works," in Wischmeyer, O. and L. Scornaeienchi, eds. *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur: Texte und Kontexte*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 621-50.
- Kallner-Amiran, D.H. 1950-51. "A Revised Earthquake-Catalogue of Palestine." *Israel Exploration Journal* 1: 223-46.
- Karlsson, K.E. 1981. *Syntax and Affixation: The Evolution of MENTE in Latin and Romance*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Karras, V. 2005. "A Re-Evaluation of Marriage, Celibacy and Irony in Gregory of Nyssa's 'On Virginity.'" *JECS* 13 (1): 111-121.
- Kelly, J.N.D. 1975. *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kleinbauer, W.E. 2006. "Antioch, Jerusalem, and Rome: The Patronage of Emperor Constantius II and Architectural Invention." *Gesta* 45: 125-45
- Koster, S. 1980. *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain.
- Kötting, B. 1965. *Der frühchristliche Reliquienkult und die Bestattung im Kirchengebäude*. Cologne: Westdeutsche Verlag.
- Kulikowski, M. 1996. "Two Councils of Turin." *JThS* 47 (1): 159-68.
- Labriolle, P. de. 1913. *La Crise Montanist*. Paris: E. Leroux.

- Lacocque, A. 1979. *The Book of Daniel*. London: SPCK.
- Laurence, P. 1998. "L'implication des femmes dans l'hérésie: Le jugement de Saint Jérôme." *REA* 44: 241-267.
- Layton, B. 1989. "The Significance of Basilides in Ancient Christian Thought." *Representations* 28: 135-51.
- Layton, R.A. 2002. "Plagiarism and Lay Patronage of Ascetic Scholarship: Jerome, Ambrose, and Rufinus." *J ECS* 10: 489-522.
- Levy, H. L. 1946. "Claudian's *In Rufinum* and the Rhetorical ψόγος." *TAPA* 77: 57-65.
- Lieu, S. 1989. *The Emperor Julian: Panegyric and Polemic*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- . 1992. *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Lizop, R. 1931. *Les Convenae et Les Consoranni*. Vol. 25. Toulouse & Paris: Bibliotheque Meridionale.
- Long, J. 1996. *Claudian's In Eutropium or How, When, and Why to Slander a Eunuch*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lössl, J. 1998. "Satire, Fiction, and Reference to Reality in Jerome's *Epistula* 117." *VigChr* 52: 172-192.
- . 2005. "An Early Christian Identity Crisis Triggered by Changes in the Discourse on Martyrdom: The Controversy between Jerome of Stridon and Vigilantius of Calagurris." *More than a Memory: The Discourse of Martyrdom and the Construction of Christian Identity in the History of Christianity*: 97-116.
- Lucassen, L.H. 1960. "De Polemicus Hieronymus Adversus De Priester Vigilantius." *Hermeneus* 32: 53-61.
- Lucius, E. and G. Anrich. 1904. *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Luebeck, E. 1872. *Hieronymus quos nouerit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Massie, M. 1980. "Vigilance de Calagurris face à la polémique hiéronymienne. Les fondements et la signification du conflit." *BLE* 81: 81-108.

- Mathisen, R. 1991. "Phoebus, Orpheus, and Dionysus: Nicknames and the Literary Circle of Sidonius" in *Studies in the History, Literature and Society of Late Antiquity*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert. 29-44.
- . "The Use and Misuse of Jerome in Gaul during Late Antiquity," in A. Cain and J. Lössl, eds., 191-208.
- McCane, R. 1992. "Is a Corpse Contagious? Early Jewish and Christian Attitudes toward the Dead," *SBL* 31: 378-388.
- McCulloh, J. M. 1976. "The Cult of Relics in the Letters and Dialogues of Pope Gregory the Great. A Lexicographical Study." *Traditio* 32: 154-184.
- McLynn, N. 1994. *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mohrmann, C. 1951. "Saint Jérôme et Saint Augustin sur Tertullien." *VigChr* 5: 111-112.
- . 1954. "Sacramentum dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens." *HThR* 47: 141-52.
- . 1977. *Études Sur Le Latin Des Chrétiens*. 4 vols. Rome: Edizione d'Istoria e Letteratura.
- Morard, F. -E. 1973. "Monachos, Moine. Histoire du terme grec jusqu'au 4e Siècle. Influences bibliques et gnostiques." *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 20: 332-411.
- Nash, G. 2010. *The Liberty Bell*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Nautin, P. 1972. "Études de chronologie hieronymienne." *REA* 18: 209-18.
- . 1973. "Études de chronologie hieronymienne." *REA* 19: 69-86 and 213-39.
- . 1974. "Études de chronologie hieronymienne." *REA* 20: 251-84.
- Neue, F. 1892. *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. 4 vols. Leipzig.
- Oberhelman, S.M. 1988a. "The *Cursus* in Late Imperial Latin Prose: A Reconsideration of Methodology." *CP* 83: 136-49.
- . 1988b. "The History and Development of the *Cursus Mixtus* in Latin Literature." *CQ* 38: 228-42.
- Oberhelman, S.M. and R.G. Hall. 1984. "A New Statistical Analysis of Accentual Prose Rhythms in Imperial Latin Authors." *CP* 79: 114-30.
- . 1985. "Meter in Accentual Clausulae of Late Imperial Latin Prose." *CP* 80: 214-27.

- O'Connell, J.P. 1948. *The Eschatology of Saint Jerome*. Mundelein: Saint Mary on the Lake.
- Olson, K. 2003. "Roman Underwear Revisited." *CW* 96: 201-210.
- Opelt, I. 1965. *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.
- . 1973. *Hieronymus' Streitschriften*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.
- Oppel, John. 1993. "Saint Jerome and the History of Sex." *Viator* 24: 1-22.
- Parker, R. 1990. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pearson, B.A. 1990. "Cain and the Cainites," in Pearson, ed. *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 95-107.
- . 2008. "Basilides the Gnostic," in A. Marjanen and P. Luomanen, eds. *A Companion to Second-Century Christian "Heretics."* Leiden: Brill, 1-31.
- Penn, M.P. 2005. *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pépin, J. 1976. *Mythe et allégorie. Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo—chrétiennes*. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes.
- Perrin, M.Y. 1992. "Ad implendum caritatis ministerium. La place des courriers dans la correspondance de Paulin de Nole." *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Antiquité* 104 (2): 1025-68.
- Race, W.H. 1982. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*. Leiden: Brill.
- Rebenich, S. 1992. *Hieronymus und sein Kreis: prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Vol. 72. Franz Steiner Verlag.
- . 2002. *Jerome*. London: Routledge.
- Rébillard, E. 2009. *The Care of the Dead in Late Antiquity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Rilinger, R. 1988. *Humiliores-Honestiores: Zu einer sozialen Dichotomie im Strafrecht der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Rinaldi, G. 1962. *La Sacra Bibbia: Daniele*. Turin-Rome: Marietti.
- Rousseau, P. 1978. *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church in the Age of Jerome and Cassian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ruggiero, A., H. Crouzel, and G. Santaniello. 1983. *Paolino di Nola : Momenti della sua vita e delle sue opere*. Diocesana: S. Paolino.
- Sanders, E.P. 1990. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*. London: SCM Press.
- Saxer, V. 1980. *Morts, martyrs, reliques en Afrique chrétienne aux premiers siècles*. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Schneider, A.M. 1928. *Refrigerium nach literarischen Quellen und Inschriften*. Freiburg im Breisgau.
- Schwind, J. 1997. "Hieronymus' *Epistula ad Innocentium* (epist. 1) - ein Jugendwerk?" *Wiener Studien* 110: 171-86.
- Scourfield, J. H. D. 1993. *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome's Letter 60*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1997. "A Note on Jerome's Homily on the Rich Man and Lazarus." *JThS* N. S. 48 (2): 536-539.
- Setzer, C. 2004. *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Shanzer, D. 2008. "Bible, Exegesis, Literature, and Society." *JML* 18: 120-57.
- . 2009. "Jerome, Tobit, Alms, and the *Vita Aeterna*," in A. Cain and J. Lössl, eds., 87-104.
- . 2014. "One Dead Girl, Two Living Ladies, Quohélet, and the Judgment of Man: Eschatological Problems, Particular Judgment, and Jerome's *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*" in Elisabeth Birnbaum and Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger, eds. *Hieronymus als Exeget und Theologe. Interdisziplinäre Zugänge zum „Kohéletkommentar“ des Hieronymus*, "Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium" forthcoming Peeters Leuven.
- Skemp, V. 2011. "Learning by Example: Exempla in Jerome's Translations and Revisions of Biblical Books." *VigChr* 65: 257-84.
- Skutsch, F. 1905. "Ennius." *RE* 5: 2589-2628.
- Smith, J. 2006. "The Body of Paradise and the Body of the Resurrection: Gender and the Angelic Life in Gregory of Nyssa's *De Hominis Opificio*." *HThR* 99 (2): 207-228.
- . 2012. "Portable Christianity: Relics in the Medieval West (c. 700-c. 1200)." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 181: 143-167.

- Sorensen, E. 2002. *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Spevak, O. 2010. *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Stancliffe, C. 1983. *St. Martin and His Hagiographer: History and Miracle in Sulpicius Severus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stewart, Z. 1960. "The God Nocturnus in Plautus' *Amphitruo*." *JRS* 50: 37-43.
- Strack, H.L. and P. Billerbeck. 1961. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 4 vols. München: CH Beck.
- Stuiber, A. 1957. *Refrigerium interim*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag.
- Ternes, C.M, et al. 1993. *Foi, Raison, Verbe : Mélanges in Honorem Julien Ries / Éd. par Charles Marie Ternes avec la Collab. de Michel Delahoutre, André Motte & Jean-Claude Polet*. Luxembourg: Centre Universitaire de Luxembourg Séminaire d'études anciennes.
- Torres, J. 2009. "Emperor Julian and the Veneration of Relics." *Antiquité Tardive* 17: 205-214.
- Trevett, C. 1996. *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trout, D. 1999. *Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters, and Poems*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Uthemann, K.-H. 1993. "Die Sprache der Theologie nach Eunomius von Cyzicus." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 104 (2): 143-175.
- Vaggione, R. 2000. *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dam, R. 1993. *Saints and their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Vanderspoel, J. 1986. "Claudian, Christ and the Cult of the Saints." *CQ* 36: 244-255.
- Vannier, M-A. 2003. "S. Augustin et le culte des reliques." *Connaissance Des Pères De l'Église* 89: 42-47.
- Verrall, A.W. 1905. *Essays on Four Plays of Euripides*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vives, J. et al., eds. 1963. *Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos*. Barcelona-Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Enrique Flórez.

- Vogel, W. 2010. *The Cultic Motif in the Book of Daniel*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Weber, R. 2007. *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Whitby, M. and Mary Whitby. 1989. *Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Widengren, G. 1965. *Mani and Manichaeism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Wiesen, D.S. 1964. *St. Jerome as a Satirist: A Study in Christian Latin Thought and Letters*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Winiarczyk, M. 2002. *Euhemeros Von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung*. Leipzig: K.G. Saur.
- Wiśniewski, R. 2011. "Lucilla and the Bone: Remarks on an Early Testimony to the Cult of Relics." *JLA* 4: 157-61.
- Woods, D. 1991. "The Date of the Translation of the Relics of SS. Luke and Andrew to Constantinople," *VigChr* 45 (3): 286-292.
- Ziegler, J. 1939. *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Zielinski, Th. 1914. *Der constructive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden*. Leipzig: Dieterich.
- Zucker, F. 1905. "Euhemerus und Seine Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ bei den Christlichen Schriftstellern." *Philologus* 64: 465-71.